Juſt Publiſh'd the Second Edition of

A Preſervative againſt Atheiſm and Infidelity, in Three Books, I. Proving the Exiſtence of a God, a Providence, and the Immortality of the Soul. II. The Neceſſity of a Religion Reveal'd by God. III. That the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion were Reveal'd by God: With an Introduction ſhewing the Cauſes, pernicious Effects, and Cure of Infidelity. By *Peter La Touch*, Gent. Price bound 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Miſcellaneous Remains of Cardinal *Perron*, Preſident *Thuanus*, Monſieur St. *Evremont*, and Mr. *Chevieau*, In 2 Vol. 1*ſt*. Of Converſation, of ſolid Study, of theKnowledge of the World, of Religion, of Flattery, of human Frailty, a Converſation with two Travellers. 2d, Of Juſtice, ſeveral Letters ſerious and pleaſant; of Devotion, of impious Men, of the Debauchery; a Word of Eloquence, of Painting, a pleaſant and curious Deſcription of *Paris*. Price 5 *s.* all Printed for *S. Butler.*

Juſt Publiſh'd the Second Edition of

A Preſervative againſt Atheiſm and Infidelity, in Three Books, I. Proving the Exiſtence of a God, a Providence, and the Immortality of the Soul. II. The Neceſſity of a Religion Reveal'd by God. III. That the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion were Reveal'd by God: With an Introduction ſhewing the Cauſes, pernicious Effects, and Cure of Infidelity. By *Peter La Touch*, Gent. Price bound 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Miſcellaneous Remains of Cardinal *Perron*, Preſident *Thuanus*, Monſieur St. *Evremont*, and Mr. *Chevieau*, In 2 Vol. 1*ſt*. Of Converſation, of ſolid Study, of theKnowledge of the World, of Religion, of Flattery, of human Frailty, a Converſation with two Travellers. 2d, Of Juſtice, ſeveral Letters ſerious and pleaſant; of Devotion, of impious Men, of the Debauchery; a Word of Eloquence, of Painting, a pleaſant and curious Deſcription of *Paris*. Price 5 *s.* all Printed for *S. Butler.*

THE MYSTERY OF ANABAPTISM UNMASK'D;

Being a full and Satisfactory VINDICATION of

INFANT BAPTISM

In the Church of *England*,

As to Subjects and Mode.

IN ANSWER

To the fallacious Arguments, and pernicous Errors of Mr. *Morgan*, Mr. *Stennet*, Mr. *Keach*, Mr. *Hook*, Mr. *John Gale*, and other Principal Leaders of the *Dipping-Sect*.

Publish'd again

To give Satisfaction to Doubting Christians, to silence Gain-Sayers, and return an Answer to some of the late Reflections on Mr. *Wall*'s History of *Infant-Baptism*;

To which is Added,

DISCOURCES, I. Upon the Christian Sabbath, II. Original Sin, III. Forms of Prayer and our Liturgy, IV. Sinfulness of Schism, V. The Danger of Apostacy VI. the History of the Anabaptists from their first Appearance in Foreign Parts, and in *England*.

By MARIUS D'ASSIGNY, B. D.

LONDON:

Printed for *S. Butler* in *Holbourn*, and Sold by *Jonathan Robinson*, and *H. Clements* in St. *Paul's-Church-Yard*, *R. Sare* at *Grays Inn-Gate*, and *William Taylor* in *Pater Noster-Row*, and other Booksellers. Price Bound 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

Formerly Publish'd.

AN Antidote against the pernicious Errors of the *Anabaptists* or of the *Dipping-Sect*. Wherein the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *England*, in relation to *Infant-Baptism*, are briefly justified and confirmed by Holy Scripture and Reason, by the approved custom of Christians in all Ages since the Apostles; and by the judgment of all the Reformed Churches in *Europe*; and wherein all objections are fully Answered; by *Marius D'Assigny*, B. D. Printed for *William Taylor* in *Pater-Noster-Row*, and *H. Clements* at the *Half-Moon* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*. Price Bound one Shilling. 1708.

There will shortly be Publish'd,

REMARKS

ON some weak malicious and false Reflections of Mr. *John Gale*, on Mr. *Wall's* History of *Infant-Baptism*, by the same Hand.

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in God,

HENRY

Lord Biſhop of *London.*

My Lord,

HE Divine Truths, and the Cauſe of God and Religion, that I maintain

againſt a pernicious and heretical Sect, have encourag'd me to lay before Your Lordſhip, and humbly to preſent to You my Vindication of our Orthodox Doctrines and Practices in this Controverſy; and the rather, becauſe Your Lordſhip hath always declared Your ſelf a noble Patron of our Church and its Evangelick Principles, and an eminent Defender

fender of its Rights and Holy Orders, againſt all Oppoſers in the worſt of Times; I am therefore perſuaded that this my Deſign and Endeavours to diſcover to the World the Errors and miſchievous Purpoſes of this *Myſtery of Anabaptiſm*, that ſtrikes at the Honour and Being of the Epiſcopal Function and Clergy, and overthrows all Chriſtianity amongſt

us, cannot but be grateful to ſo much holy Zeal, Prudence and Care for the Glory of our Redeemer, as have conſtantly appear'd in Your Lordſhip's Life and Actions.

If this my Performance may be ſo happy to meet with Approbation in Your Lordſhip's Judgment, to anſwer the End for which it is intended, namely

to

to juſtify our Church's reaſonable and ſacred Belief, and Practices, and be able to ſilence Gainſayers, I ſhall obtain my principal Purpoſe in this Addreſs.

May the Divine Providence continue Your Lordſhip many Years amongſt us, for the Glory of God, the Good of his Church, and the Salvation of Souls, and after this mortal Race, and

the faithful Discharge of Your great Trust, may Your Immortal Being be welcom'd into the Joy of our Lord; this shall ever be the Prayer of

Your Lordship's

Most Humble,

Most Obedient,

And dutiful Servant,

MARIUS D' ASSIGNY.

THE PREFACE.

THE intolerable Inſolence of this Pernicious Sect, that dares bid publick Defiance to the plaineſt and moſt expreſs Truths of the Goſpel, contradict the Spirit of God, and whiſper about, and amongſt their Proſelytes apparent Falſities, has oblig'd me to pull off the Mask of this Myſtery of Satan, *and to ſhew it to the World without its counterfeit Diſguiſe, in its true Shape and Features; for that Purpoſe I have examin'd its moſt celebrated Authors, and anſwer'd their Principal Objections againſt Infant Baptiſm, and our Mode of Sprinkling, and prov'd both to be agreeable with holy Scripture, and the Mind and Commands of our Bleſſed Redeemer. I have likewiſe here confirm'd my Eight Arguments of my firſt Antidote, and ſhew'd the Inſignificancy of Mr.* Morgan's *Exceptions againſt them; and becauſe Mr.* Baxter *hath in his Book of plain Scripture Proof*

for

For Infants Church-Membership, several weighty Reasons to evidence the Right of Infants to the Ordinance of Baptism, I have abbreviated and contracted his Arguments, and added them to the former; and for our Mode of Sprinkling, I cannot but wonder that so many learned Men have mistaken the Scripture Meaning of the Greek Word βαπτίζειν, and yielded to our Adversaries, that its natural Signification is to dip, whereas from the Beginning of Genesis *to the End of the* Revelations, *and in all the* Apocrypha, *'tis not understood by the Spirit of God in that Sense, but for Sprinkling and Washing: I have perhaps more fully examin'd this Question and important Truth than any before me; It concerns us to take a particular Notice of this Observation, for this is one of their chief Objections with which they deceive the Ignorant People, to draw them to Apostacy from our Church, by persuading them that our Mode of Baptism is not conformable to Christ's Institution, and that without a total Immersion they cannot be Christians. By this diabolical Insinuation they cause them to renounce their first lawful and evangelick Baptism with the Benefits then receiv'd from the Divine*

vine Mercy by the Hands of the lawful Miniſters to be dipped into their Sect, and to embrace their pernicious Errors, and thereby confirmed in their Separation from our Church and Communion, and in their Averſion to our Worſhip, from which they run, as from a publick Infection; ſo ſtrange an Influence their Leaders have upon the Minds of their bewitched Proſelytes. Some of them have been known within a few Years to have been zealouſly affected to the Church of England, *and now ſince their Engagement in this Sect ſeem to hate and abominate both our Perſons and Communion, they ſhun our publick Devotions, and refuſe to be preſent at the Prayers for the Sick, or any other Offices of our Church. Many of theſe deluded People are thus carried away by the Devil's Artifices, and continually loading us and our Miniſtry with Reproaches and falſe Accuſations, and ſome are guilty of plain Blaſphemy againſt God and his Divine Truths; to prove this Charge, I appeal to the Writings of* Joſeph Taylor, *where he ſeems in expreſs Words to prefer* Mahomet *and his abominable Religion to* Chriſt *and* Chriſtianity. *I appeal to the Books of* Matth. Caffin, *and* Tho. Monk, *where we may read* Arianiſm, Socinianiſm, *and*

the

the worſt of Hereſies publiſh'd by theſe ignorant and extravagant Mechanicks, who pretend to underſtand the Holy Scriptures better than all the Orthodox Churches of Chriſt and his lawful Miniſters; divers of them have now left their Trades and Shops, and caſt away their Tools to teach in their Meetings, and command over the Conſciences and Purſes of ſuch ſilly Wretches as have abandoned themſelves to the Conduct of theſe Agents of Satan: I confeſs ſome of this Sect may be good moral and well meaning Men, who have been deluded into this erroneous Perſuaſion; but I have obſerved generally Hypocriſy to reign amongſt them, and that they affect a plauſible Behaviour, a pretended Sweetneſs, Humility, Goodneſs, Charity and Kindneſs in the Eyes of the World, to conceal the fouleſt Deſigns, Actions, Immoralities, and Hereſies; ſo that to underſtand an Anabaptiſt *truly, we muſt pull off his Hypocritical Vizard, with which he coſens the ignorant World, and deceives them into a favourable Opinion of his Perſon, Belief, and Sect; one would think when he pleads from us for a charitable Judgment of himſelf and Diſſenting Party, that he intends to ſhew that good Example by a civil and kind Opinion of the Practices and Perſuaſions of thoſe that*

are

are contrary to him; but how oppoſite this is to their conſtant Dealing among themſelves, the Reproaches and bitter Invectives of the Caſſinites *and the* Monkiſts *againſt one another in their printed Books, can ſufficiently evidence; now if they are ſo furiouſly bent againſt their own Brethren, as to condemn them to the Gallows, to the Fire, and to Hell for ſmall Differences in their Judgments about God's Decrees, Predeſtination, the Divine and Human Natures of Chriſt, and other myſterious Matters which neither of them underſtand, what Treatment are we to expect from theſe charitable Souls, we who are oppoſite to them as Light is to Darkneſs: Truly their ſecret Whiſperings amongſt our People of their pernicious Principles, their ridiculing the Ordinances of God, their viliſying of our Functions and Miniſtry, the many ſcandalous Reproaches and Blaſphemies caſt upon our Adminiſtrations and Worſhip of God, and their declaring our Baptiſm a Nullity, and our Perſons no Chriſtians, are ſufficient Evidences of their Charity for us who cannot be of their Perſuaſion: Now what Meaſures ought we in reaſon to obſerve with this Sect, that has publickly declar'd open War againſt us, and are privately undermining our Church and Govern-*

ment,

ment, to blow all up at once? Are we to treat them as Chriſtians who have abjured their firſt Chriſtianity, and are Apoſtates to our Church? Are we to cheriſh this viperous Brood in our Breaſts, and warm them in our Boſoms, while they are ſtinging us to Death? Are we to call them Brethren and Friends at that Moment they murder our Reputations, and deny us our Right and Title to our holy Profeſſion; ſuch unſeaſonable Civility and charitable Behaviour is altogether unreaſonable to be expected from us, and would ſavour of the like Hypocriſy that is remarkable and viſible in theſe demure Profeſſors; and as ſome Diſeaſes are increas'd by mollifying Salves and ſweet Receipts, and Lenitives, this Hereſy of the Anabaptiſts *is not to be cured by favourable Conceſſions, charitable Allowances, gracious Expreſſions, and kind Appellations, which are more likely to confirm theſe unadviſed and ignorant Souls in their grievous Miſtakes, than to perſuade them out of them, as we have found by Experience; let not the Chriſtian Reader therefore be offended at my plain Dealing with them, I advance nothing but what is agreeable with Truth, Reaſon, and holy Stripture, and I am ſure I have the bleſſed*

Exam-

Example of Chriſt and his Prophets and Apoſtles to warrant my Proceedings, for we find them treating the ſame ſort of Men in the ſame manner without Flattery, which is not proper in this Caſe; 'tis true they have a Toleration from our wiſe Government, but if they did not abuſe this kind Allowance, as really they do, ſecretly to overthrow both Church and State, they would not be ſo worthy of Blame as really they are. Our reverend Biſhops and the Body of the Church of England, *have conſented to this Toleration; but what ungrateful Returns they have made to us for ſuch a Kindneſs, let the World judge, they have degraded the ſacred Epiſcopal Order by giving the Name of Biſhops to their mechanick Teachers; that venerable Name and Function reverenced by the Heathens, as by all Antiquity, has by them been thus vilify'd and under-valued; in a word, the whole miniſterial Order in Chriſt's Church amongſt us is blown up, and deſtroy'd, and we and our People are declared by theſe charitable Friends, theſe grateful Souls, in Requital of all our Allowances and publick Grants, to be no Chriſtians. This is the evident and publick Declaration of this* Myſtery of Anabaptiſm, *as I ſhall make it appear more at large. I muſt there-*

fore

fore take the Liberty to lay open its pernicious Errors without Diſſimulation and Flattery; and becauſe divers of their chief Teachers are Jewiſh Sabbatarians, Pelagians, *&c. I have thought convenient to recommend to the Publick ſome ſhort Diſcourſes upon our* Chriſtian Sabbath, *and Original Sin, to prevent the popular Errors upon thoſe two Topicks; upon Forms of Prayer, and our excellent Liturgy, upon the Sinfulneſs of Schiſm, and the Danger of Apoſtacy, and revolting from our Church; and in the Concluſion I have given a true Account of the Proceedings of this Sect from the Time of their firſt Appearance in the World in foreign Parts, and here amongſt us in* England *from their firſt Arrival, by which Relation Men may underſtand what an innocent and holy Sect this is, how conformable to the Evangelick Doctrines and Precepts, or rather how oppoſite and contrary to the Mind of Chriſt and his Goſpel. I pray God to bleſs theſe my Endeavours, to open the Eyes of our deluded Neighbours to ſee the Truth, that they have forſaken, and to repent of their great Sin; I pray God to confirm the reſt of our People in the Profeſſion of his holy Religion againſt all Errors and*

Mi-

Miſtakes without wavering, that they may continue faithful unto Chriſt until Death, and at laſt obtain from him the Crown of Life. Amen.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Mr.

The Contents.

The

The Contents.

THE

The Names and Trades of ſome of the *Anabaptiſts* Principal Teachers, and their Meetings.

MR. *Joſeph Stennet*, *Cheap-ſide*.
Mr. *John Pigget* in *Wild-ſtreet*.
——*Glover*, a Glaſier of *White-Chapel*, *Virginia-ſtreet*.
——*Midlane*, a Weaver, *Savory's Dock*. *Southwark*.
Rich. Angel, a Cooper, *Angel-Alley*, *White-Chapel*.
——*Malden*, a Shooemaker, a Leg of Mutton Baptiſt.
——*Congrove*, a Taylor, in *Goodman's-Fields*.
——*Osburne*, a Glaſs-maker.
Sam. Hall, a Baker.
——*Perkins*, in *Bore's-Head-Yard* in *Catharine-Wheel-Alley*.
——*Davies*, in *White-Chapel*.
——*Jacobs*, a Lifeguard-Man, in *Southwark*.
——*Foxhall*, a Butcher, in *Horſey-Downes*.
Joſ. Jenkins, a Ribbon-Weaver, in *Harts-ſtreet*.
——*Mullener*, a Taylor, in *White's-Alley*, *Moreſields*.

——*Stevens*,

——*Stevens*, a Journeyman Shoe-maker, *Roſemary-lane*.
Mr. *Croſeley* in *Cripple-Gate*.
William Rawlins, a Taylor, of St. *Neots*, *Huntingtonſhire*.
Nath. Alcock, a Farmer of *Bedfordſhire*.
Sam. Gurrey, a Farmer in *Bedfordſhire*.
Jo. Nutter of St. *Neots*, Sieve-maker.
——*Skingle*, a Smith of *Hartfordſhire*.
Rich. Robinſon, a Thatcher of *Upminſter* in *Eſſex*.
J. Paine, a Shooe-maker of *Veil* in *Eſſex*.
——*Gander*, a Tinman about *Shadwell*.
——*Burch*, a Hatter.
——*Sunford*, a Tallow-Chandler.

Theſe and ſuch like Perſons are the Leaders of this Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*, and by theſe we may judge of the reſt. There are a great Number of them about *London*, but their Names and Meeting-Houſes I cannot yet learn.

A VINDICATION OF Infant-Baptiſm, AGAINST THE Dipping Sect.

I Am not ſorry that this Controverſy, which has remain'd dormant for ſome Years, is again reviv'd in theſe unhappy Days. For while we have been aſleep, our Adverſaries have been watchful, and buſie in ſowing Tares, in poiſoning our People with their Damnable Hereſie, and ſpreading abroad their pernicious Principles. What Progreſs they have made, is not unknown to ſuch as are acquainted with the preſent State of Religion in this Nation. The ſimple and unlearned are inſenſibly

drawn away by their bewitching Inſinuations in Cities and Country, have been by them perſwaded to renounce their firſt Faith and Baptiſm, and to engage themſelves in this Sect, to the apparent Hazard of their Salvation.

Tho' this Perſwaſion hath been long ago, and frequently overcome and baffled by the Pious Endeavours of learned Men, yet now again it dares lift up its Head, and bid defiance to the moſt viſible Truths of the Goſpel; and being encouraged by the numerous Increaſe of its Ignorant Proſelytes, it threatens with Subverſion both our Church and State. I hope God may ſo far bleſs my Endeavours, that I may be an Inſtrument to prevent further Miſchief, and ſtop the Increaſe of this Error, ſo deſtructive to the Souls of Infants, to the Welfare of Chriſtianity in general, and to the Peace of our Church, Kingdom, and People. This was the Motive that prevail'd upon me to publiſh my Firſt *Antidote*; for finding a Number of my Neighbours in *Eſſex* deluded by the *Anabaptiſts*, and knowing the Wickedneſs and Danger of this Sect, and how contrary to the Holy Oracles, and the Mind of Chriſt, I writ my Thoughts of Infant-Baptiſm, as briefly as the Subject would permit, for the Information of thoſe whom I am obliged to take Care of, and of others, who are not yet carried away with this Deluſion of Satan. But aſſoon as my Book appear'd abroad, the Adverſe Party were

were alarm'd at my repreſenting them Pernicious and Erroneous; and one who has more Zeal for his Sect than Reaſon, Ability or Learning to defend it, pretends to anſwer me; but how weakly, how rudely, ſcurrilouſly and uncivilly, I leave to the Chriſtian Reader to judge. He calls himſelf *R. Morgan*, and I underſtand he is a School-maſter about *Wapping*: A Perſon well qualify'd to inſtill ill Principles into Youth, and do miſchief in his Station! I could have wiſh'd he had been a Man of more Senſe, Civility and Sincerity. I cannot but take notice of one of the ſame Name in the *Jeſuits* College of *Rome*; and another *Morgan*, if not the ſame Perſon, amongſt the Popiſh Prieſts in *England*: The firſt is mention'd in the Letters concerning the *Quietiſts*, both buſie and active Enemies of the Church of *England*. 'Tis known theſe Firebrands of Hell are amongſt our Diſſenters, chiefly amongſt the *Anabaptiſts*. My Adverſary is repreſented to me as a Seventh-day-dipper, and as the *Britiſh* Name of *Pelagius* the Heretick was *Morgan*, I fancy there is more than One or Two Relations between my School-maſter and that old Adverſary of the Truth, and Diſturber of the Publick Peace of the *African* Church; for we may perceive in him the ſame deceitful and obſtinate Spirit that admits of no Repentance; a Spirit both blind and deaf to Reaſon and Divine Revelation, that rejects the cleareſt Truths, and the moſt approved

Doctrines, which contradict its Perſwaſion and Practices, as we may take notice in the following Reply to Mr. *Morgan*'s trifling and imperfect Anſwer to my Arguments and Reaſons for *Infant-Baptiſm.* I might have been excuſed from making any Return, or minding ſuch an inſignificant Pamphlet, that ſerves to no other purpoſe, but to make good again the old Fable of *Midas* with his Aſſes Ears. But underſtanding that his Party is very diligent in handing it about the City and Country, as the like Heretical Books, and for fear it might do the more Miſchief, if I were ſilent, I have been forced to this *Second Antidote*; wherein you have a further Juſtification of the Doctrines and Practices of our Church, in oppoſition to the Errors of this *Dipping-Sect*, with other Particulars fit for the Cognizance of our People, to prevent this growing Miſchief.

I ſhall paſs over the uncivil, rude and abuſive Title of his Libel, which to diſcredit me the more he caus'd to be put into the publick Prints, and ſhall prove his charge there againſt me of perverting the Word of God, to be a Slander, falſe and malicious. I ſhall begin with Page Four, where he ſaith: He *could be glad to ſee in my Book a Spirit becoming a Gentleman, a Scholar,* or a *Chriſtian,* &c. But *R. M.* who ſeems to be not acquainted with ſuch a Spirit, and diſcovers in his whole Performance a Genius quite contrary to the Dictates of ſuch a Spirit, cannot

not be a good Judge in this Caſe. If he had known what becomes a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Chriſtian, methinks he ſhould have allowed to my Perſon, Character and Function, one of theſe Titles, which he grants, and liberally beſtows upon his Blue, Green, White, and Leathern-Apron Preachers; but I muſt be content to ſwallow this and many other ſuch unmannerly Reflections from him and his Sect, who always caſt Dirt upon thoſe, who endeavour to recall them out of their Hereſie, and never fail to reward their moſt charitable Endeavours with Slander and Abuſe. I am not conſcious to my ſelf of having ſaid or publiſh'd any thing in relation to them, but what becomes Truth, the Honour of my Calling, and the common Practice of Chriſtianity. Did not the Prophets reprove the *Jews* for their Errors and Vices, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles the ancient *Phariſees*, without breaking through the Rules of Good Manners? We are to lay open Sin, Error and Impiety, without any regard to ſuch Nice and Tender Minds, who are like thoſe that were formerly diſtemper'd with a certain Malady call'd the *Sweating Sickneſs*; when the kind Phyſician applied to them his Remedies to cure them, they cried out *Murder, Murder, ye kill me, ye kill me.* I cannot with a good Conſcience flatter or encourage them in their Pernicious Errors, but muſt ſpeak to them in the Language of Mr. *Baxter*: *Sin and Schiſm have dealt ſo bitterly with* Eng-

land, my Native Country, *and eſpecially the Schiſm of the Anabaptiſts*, which yet continues to deal ſo bitterly with our Church and Kingdom, *that I dare not deal ſweetly with it.* However by this firſt Eſſay of *R. Morgan*'s Pen, I underſtand how I am to be treated by him.

It ſeems he acknowledges the Children brought to Chriſt to be Infants, which ſome Anabaptiſts have denied: But he rejects the Inferences, that we and all the Reformed Churches draw from this Relation of Three *Evangeliſts*, *Matth.* 19. 14. *Mark* 10. 14. *Luke* 18. 16 to warrant the Baptiſm of Babes, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Now to inform my Adverſary, and rectify his Miſtakes in this Caſe, 'tis neither from the bringing of thoſe Children, nor their coming to Chriſt, nor our Saviour's bleſſing of them, that we conclude that they are to be Baptized; therefore he might have ſpared theſe idle and impertinent Expreſſions. *If Baptiſm and Bleſſing ſignify one and the ſame thing, or if all thoſe who came to him were baptized, there might be ſome Argument.* How vainly does *R. M.* endeavour to ridicule our Reaſoning, and the Intention of Chriſt, by citing theſe imperfect Premiſes? We conclude not the Baptiſm of Infants from thence, but from the following Command, and expreſs Order, which our Saviour delivers to his Apoſtles, their Succeſſors, and all future Ages,

Ages, as a ſtanding Law and Rule to obſerve, *To ſuffer little Children to come unto him.* This Invitation had been to no purpoſe, for the benefit of others of that Age, if he had deſign'd it only while he was here upon Earth; for this Command was given at the latter end of his Miniſtry, when he was departing out of the World, as we may underſtand from the Evangeliſts, and particularly from St. *Mark*, Chap. 10. Ver. 33, 34. He was then going up to *Jeruſalem*, to ſuffer Death for Mankind. To what Intent does he invite Children to come unto him, or to receive his Bleſſing, when he was to be no longer on Earth? What Advantage could they expect from him during his ſhort Abode, if it was deſign'd for no other purpoſe, but to lay his Hands upon them and bleſs them? This Coming therefore ſpoken of by Chriſt, is a Precept directed to his Apoſtles and Miniſters of his Church, to ſuffer them, and not hinder their coming to him, and an Invitation that concerns all Infants of Believing Parents of the ſucceeding Ages, to come unto him. And if they have no other way to come unto him, now he is in Heaven, but to come into his Church, his Myſtical Body, to be Members of it, certainly we may, without any violence offer'd to the Senſe and Meaning of Chriſt, conclude, That his Will is, that they ſhould be initiated, and enter'd into it by that Ordinance that he hath appointed, which is Baptiſm. And the rather

we are to give this Interpretation to our Redeemer's Words, becauſe we find them ſpoken elſewhere for the ſame purpoſe, and importing the ſame Senſe: *Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden*, &c. *Matth.* 11. 28. By thoſe that *Labour*, we are to underſtand the *Jewiſh* Tranſgreſſors, labouring under the *Moſaick* Ordinances; by thoſe that are *heavy Laden*, the *Gentile* Sinners, loaden with Iniquity: Chriſt invites them to him, to come to be now Partakers of his Grace and Mercy. How ſhall theſe, or any other Perſons, come to Chriſt to be benefited by him, if they don't come to his Ordinance of Introduction into his Holy Profeſſion; if they continue at a Diſtance in their Impiety, Unbelief, Impenitency, and perſiſt in Communion with other Infidels. Therefore the firſt outward ſtep of their coming, is their Admittance into his Holy Religion, which was always perform'd by Baptiſm, the appointed Method. In the ſame ſignification we find this coming to Chriſt underſtood, *John* 5. 40. *Ye will not come to me, that ye might have Life.* Where Chriſt upbraids the *Jews*, becauſe of their Obſtinacy, and Rejection of him and his Profeſſion; That they would not come to it. So likewiſe *John* 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me ſhall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wiſe caſt out.* I ſuppoſe that our Adverſaries cannot deny, but that this *coming* relates to Perſons of all future Ages, who are thereby encouraged to come

come to Chriſt, to the Profeſſion and Practice of his Religion, and to the initiating Ordinance, with a gracious Aſſurance of Favour and Acceptance. And why may we not underſtand this Command of Chriſt, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, &c. in the ſame Senſe, for their Admiſſion and Entrance into his Holy Religion?

If the Rule St. *Peter* lays down for our underſtanding the Holy Scriptures be Orthodox and True, *That no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private Interpretation*, 2 Pet. 1. 20. we cannot take the Command of Chriſt but as his Intent, relating to other Children, beſides thoſe of that Time and Nation; which if we do, Pray how will you have your Infants come to Chriſt? Is there any other way preſcribed to us but Baptiſm, or an Entrance into his Covenant or Church, which is his Myſtical Body?

How does my Adverſary labour to baffle all the Concluſions, that are drawn by all Orthodox Churches from this expreſs and plain Order of Chriſt, by telling of his wondering *where the Argument lies for Baptiſm of Children in their being brought to Chriſt, that he ſhould bleſs them.* Is he ſo purblind, as not to ſee that he ſtumbles at the Beginning of the Paſſage, ſo carefully and diligently related by Three Evangeliſts, which they would not have done with that Harmony and Agreement, were it of no other Importance, but for the Advantage of the Children of

that Age and Time. Is *R. M.* ſo weak, as to think, that he can anſwer all the Arguments that a Number of Learned Proteſtants gather from this Relation of the Evangeliſts, to juſtify Infant Baptiſm, with a Wonder! Truly, an *Anabaptiſt* is a Wonder amongſt all the Profeſſors of the Chriſtian Name, for confeſſing publickly in their Catechiſm, and elſewhere, That all new born Children are out of Covenant with God; and for refuſing to bring them in at this Invitation of Chriſt.

If our Adverſaries had any eſteem for Foreign Divines, they would not deſpiſe their Judgment, that agrees with us in this Interpretation of the Words; they all look upon them as a Poſitive Order and Warrant to bring our Children to Chriſt in Baptiſm; The *Harmony of Confeſſions* underſtand them as deſign'd by our Saviour for that purpoſe; And *Calvin* in his *Inſt. of Chriſt. Relig. lib.* 4. *c.* 16. §. 7. ſays, *If it be juſt we ſhould bring Children to Chriſt, why not to be admitted to Baptiſm, the Sign or Seal of our Communion and Society with Chriſt?* *Trelcatius* in his *Inſt. Theol. lib.* 2. upon Baptiſm, affirms, *As Infants are Partakers of the Covenant, they are to be Partakers of the Sign and Seal of that Covenant,* which is Baptiſm. So likewiſe *Bucanus* in *Loc Comm.* 47. *Q.* 35. ſpeaks the ſame Language, *That there is no other means to bring Infants to Chriſt but by Baptiſm, to introduce them into the Church, which is Chriſt's My-*

Myſtical Body, for they are not yet capable of Inſtruction. Thus *Zanchius*, an Eminent Divine, tells us, *We believe alſo with all the Ancient Church, that we are to receive to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, not only the Adult, who are able to acknowledge their Repentance for their Sins, and alſo their Faith in Chriſt, but their Children alſo, becauſe they are to be reckoned as belonging to the Covenant, according to the Apoſtles* ſaying, *That the Children of Believers are Holy*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Chiefly becauſe Chriſt hath not any where alter'd the Command of God to* Abraham, *to mark with the Sign of the Covenant* alſo the *Children of Believing Parents. Nay he hath ſaid, Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* In the *Theſes* of *Saumur*, compos'd by a Number of Famous Divines, and approv'd of in this Article by all the Proteſtant Miniſters of *France*, *de Pædo-Baptiſmo*, we find this Doctrine aſſerted, *For while Children are brought into the Church, they are reckon'd in the Number of the Faithful.* And Numb. 34. *There were Two purpoſes in Circumciſion in relation to the Adult, one on God's part, and the other on Man's part*; but in relation to *Children but one till they came of Age.* And ſpeaking of *David*, and of his Child that was departed, they ſay, *That Perſuaſion of Believers of the old Teſtament, Chriſt has approved of and confirm'd by his Authority; For when Infants were brought to him ſo young, that they were carried in Arms, and were named* Brephe,

(there-

(therefore 'tis *evident that they were not capable of Reaſon*) *and the Diſciples kept them off, for they thought they would be troubleſome to Chriſt*; *he reproves their Precipitancy, and commanded to bring Infants to him, he pray'd for them, and declared* τοιούτων, &c. *Truly we are to Judge from the Wiſdom, the Goodneſs, and Mercy of Chriſt, that he prayed for nothing beſides their Salvation. That he could not doubtleſs do, but from this Suppoſition, that his Prayers would be grateful, and acceptable to God*; *but they would not have been, if God had altogether excluded thoſe Infants from a Participation of the Covenant of Grace. And why did he think fit to lay his Hands on them? That by this Action he might teſtify, that they were of the Number in whom the Promiſes of God, relating to Saving Grace, are approved and confirmed.* I could bring many other Foreign Divines, who underſtand this Text as we do, for a Command of Chriſt to bring Infants to his Ordinance of Baptiſm. But my Antagoniſt regards not their Judgment and Reaſoning, no more than of *Turks* and Infidels; but wonders at them, and we no leſs wonder at him and his Heterodox Party and Sect. Elſewhere he ranks theſe Religious Miniſters of Chriſt amongſt, and values their Piety, Learning and Perſuaſion no more than of *Turks*, *Papiſts*, and *Heathens*, as we ſhall hereafter obſerve. Therefore to deny that Baptiſm is intended here by the Command of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, is to declare againſt the Judgment

ment of the Chriſtian Church of all Ages and Nations, who give that Interpretation to the Words.

Now to render the meaning of Chriſt more intelligible, I have taken notice of the *Greek* Words ἐλθεῖν πρὸς μέ. For 'tis the common Practice of the Spirit of God in the Original Text, to explain by the choice of the Words, his Deſign and Intent, as I could inſtance in divers other Places of Holy Scripture; therefore if we take the Preposition πρὸς, *pros*, and add it to the Verb ἐλθεῖν, there will be *proſelthein*, from which Verb in another Senſe is derived the Word *Proſelyte*. I have here obſerv'd what manner of Coming Chriſt underſtands in this Place, namely ſuch a Coming, whereby Children may be Proſelyted to him; which cannot be perform'd in the Chriſtian Church but by Baptiſm. This Remark my uncivil Antagoniſt in his Title Page, and elſewhere, wrongfully calls perverting the *Greek* Text, tho' προσέλθειν τῷ θεῷ, or τῶ χριςῷ, is of the ſame ſignification as ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τὸν χριςόν. We find theſe *Greek* Words to the ſame purpoſe, *Heb.* 7. 25. σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τὲς προσερχομένες δι' αὐτῦ τῷ θεῷ. *He is able to ſave to the uttermoſt all that come unto God through him.* And can any come unto God but by the means that Chriſt hath appointed? In the ſame Senſe, without perverting the Text, you have it, *Heb.* 11. 6. If *R. M.* had been in his right Senſes, he would

would not have made ſuch a needleſs Exception; or if he had had any regard to Truth or Good Manners, he would not have accuſed me falſly and ſo publickly in Print. Since I have met with the ſame Remark in Doctor *Hammond*: *Chriſt*, ſaith he, *was ſo far from excepting againſt the Age of Children as a prejudice, or a hinderance to their coming*, that is, to their Proſelytiſm) *that he affirms them to be the Pattern of thoſe, of whom his Kingdom is to be made up.* And M^r. *Obed Wills*, who has examin'd *Henry Danvers*'s falſe and wrong Quotations, ſaith, Page 124. *The Children are brought to him by others, yet they are ſaid to come unto him*, Matth. 19. Elthein pros, *the Words of which Proſelyte is made.*

R. M. adds, Tho' if it were, it would be to little purpoſe, unleſs he could prove that προσέρχομαι always ſignifies to Proſelyte; Who knows not that this *Greek* Verb alone, is not to be underſtood in that Senſe? But when there follows πρὸς μὲ, or πρὸς τὸν χριστὸν, or τῷ χριστῷ, to come to me, or to come to Chriſt, we cannot but take it in that manner, for a *Coming* to partake of his Ordinance appointed by him, for our Introduction into the Number of his Church and People. If there be any other way now for our Infants coming to Chriſt than this, let them tell us.

But how does my Antagoniſt fly out againſt me upon this Obſervation and Interpretation

pretation of the Words, by accuſing me of *diſingenuity*, *of ſinfulneſs in adding to the Word of God*, &c. But as this Charge is falſe and ill grounded, I have no reaſon to regard it, but to pity the Weakneſs and Prejudices of my Calumniator, that carries him to ſuch Extravagant Fancies ſo oppoſite to the Mind of Chriſt, who in the Reaſon that he gives for Infants Coming, interprets his own Meaning, by ſaying, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* That is ſuch a Coming whereby they are to be enter'd into, and made Partakers of the Kingdom of God, or of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah.* And before they can be made Subjects of that Kingdom, they are to come to him by ſome Method or Inſtitution, that he hath appointed in his Church for their Reception, which we muſt neceſſarily underſtand to be Baptiſm, the Entrance or Gate into this bleſſed Kingdom.

But ſays *R. M.* to repeat this is enough to confute it, while as I think no leſs can be meant, but that Baptiſm confers Grace. 'Tis no wonder to find him in a Miſtake; 'tis his ordinary Practice to falſify my Meaning, to ſuppreſs my Reaſoning, to pervert my Senſe, to add and diminiſh from the Text, and then to exclaim againſt the vain Notions of his weak Brain, as if they were mine. If it were poſſible, I would inſtruct this miſtaken Adverſary in the true Doctrine of our Church, of Chriſtianity, and of Proteſtant Divines; which I perceive he never under-

underſtood, nor the Diſputes between us and the *Roman* Church about the Efficacy of the Sacraments. For that purpoſe I muſt tell him, That we look upon the outward Performance of Baptiſm, or the Application of Water by God's true Miniſters lawfully Call'd and Ordain'd, to be an Inſtitution commanded by Chriſt, and appointed for our firſt Admiſſion, and of our Children into the Kingdom of Grace. And none can pretend to have any perſonal Right or Claim to the outward Advantages that belong to it, who either deſpiſe or neglect this Ordinance of Chriſt, or are kept from it, whatever Men may pretend to the contrary. 'Tis true, none but the Spirit of God can confer Saving Grace; but 'tis our Duty to introduce our Infants by Prayer and Baptiſm into that Church, where this Holy Spirit works upon the Minds of Men, and produceth that Grace, which by the Mercy of God is effectual to Salvation. *R. M.* not being able to anſwer my Reaſoning, runs blindfold into another Controverſy. I ſay here no more than what our Church has declar'd, That Baptiſm is the Entrance into our Holy Profeſſion. And Mr. *Tombes* in his Diſpute againſt Mr. *Baxter*, confeſſeth, That all ought to be admitted Church Members by Baptiſm, ſaying, *I grant that Baptiſm is the way and manner of ſolemn Admiſſion into the Church, I mean the regular way.* Therefore tho' the Baptiſm of Water confers no Saving Grace,

'tis

tis often confer'd unto us in Baptiſm from the Mercy of God. No outward Agents nor Agency can work of themſelves upon the inward Spirit a Divine Change, we muſt expect that Operation from the ſanctifying Spirit of God; but as we are commanded, we are to uſe the outward Means, and introduce the Party into the Church, the Kingdom of Chriſt, that he may receive there the Bleſſings of the Holy Spirit. God's Orders are to be complied with, if we will obtain the Benefits expected; *Naaman*'s Leproſy had never been cured by a Miracle, if he had not obey'd the Prophets Appointment, and waſh'd himſelf Seven times in the River *Jordan*; The blind Man in the Goſpel, that was commanded to go and waſh in the Pool of *Siloam*, had never recover'd his Sight, if he had not ſubmitted to this Method, preſcribed to him by our Saviour. Now to pleaſure my Adverſary I will give him another Simile; St. *John* tells us of the Pool of *Bethesda*, Chap. 5. That *whoſoever firſt, after the troubling of the Water, ſtepped in, was made whole of whatſoever Diſeaſe he had.* We can't believe that the troubled Water could have that Vertue to cure all manner of Diſeaſes; 'twas the Angel of God, that was the Phyſician, or the Bleſſing and Power of God by him; but if they had not ſtept in, they had never been heal'd in that ordinary Courſe. I leave it to my Adverſary's Wiſdom to make the Application in relation to the

Baptiſm

Baptiſm of Infants, which is their *Pool of Bethesda*; and does not our Church Catechiſm tell us, That the *Sacraments are viſible Signs of inward and ſpiritual Grace ordained by Chriſt, as a Means whereby we receive the ſame, and a Pledge to aſſure us thereof?* And again, *That being by Nature Children of Wrath, we are by Baptiſm made the Children of Grace?* Likewiſe the *Anabaptiſt's Catechiſm* ſaith, *That Baptiſm becomes effectual means of Salvation, only by the Bleſſing of Chriſt*, &c. What do I ſay more? Let any Perſon of any ordinary Capacity judge between me and my wiſe School-Maſter, and he ſhall find his abuſive Reflections, and Truth on my ſide. If it be the Kingdom of Grace, we all know that Baptiſm is a viſible Entrance into it; this he leaves out, and the following Reaſons, which he cannot deny; and this Expreſſion, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, diſcovers their fitneſs in that tender and innocent Age to be admitted. Unleſs they be brought to, and made Partakers of Baptiſm, they cannot have any Right or Real Intereſt in that ſpiritual Kingdom, or to its Advantages unto which Chriſt invites them: For, as under the Law, they who were not Circumciſed, were to be cut off and excluded from God's People and Church, ſo under the Goſpel, unbaptized Perſons cannot be reckon'd amongſt Chriſt's Diſciples, or Members of his Church or Kingdom, *&c.* To all this *R. M.* gives no anſwer. What is there here ſo contrary

to

to our Churches Doctrine, to the Harmony of Confeſſions, or anywiſe agreeing with the Errors of the *Church of Rome?* Does not our Rubrick in the beginning of the Adminiſtration, ſpeak after our Saviour's Words, *That none can enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be Regenerate and Born a New of Water*, &c. Does not the Miniſter in Chriſt's Name receive the Child into the Congregation of Chriſt's Flock by Baptiſm? Does not the Miniſter immediately after Baptiſm declare, *Seeing that this Child is Regenerate and grafted into the Body of Chriſt's Church*, &c. And do not we then thank God? *That he hath been pleaſed to Regenerate the Child with his Holy Spirit, to receive him for his own Child by Adoption, and to incorporate him into his Holy Church.* Here is more in this Thankſgiving ſuppoſed to be effected at Baptiſm, than I affirm, and yet agreeable with the Current of Scripture, namely a Spiritual Regeneration, as well as a viſible Introduction into the Number of Chriſt's Diſciples. And conformable to this Doctrine is the Anſwer in the Catechiſm: *In my Baptiſm, wherein I was made a Member of Chriſt, the Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.* But my learned Antagoniſt underſtands not his own Catechiſm, no more than ours, nor his Confeſſion of Faith, where he may read, *Baptiſm is an Ordinance of the* New Teſtament, *ordained by Jeſus Chriſt to be unto the Party Baptized a ſign of his fellowſhip with*

with him in his Death and Reſurrection, of his being ingrafted into him, of Remiſſion of Sins, &c. As 'tis a viſible ſign, when Perſons are partakers of it according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, we have reaſon to believe, from his Promiſe annext to it, that they obtain inviſible Grace, not from the Water, nor the Sanctity of the Adminiſtrator, but from the Mercy, Goodneſs and Efficacy of Chriſt and his Holy Spirit, which are not wanting to our Obedience and Compliance with his Orders, in things never ſo mean in appearance. But my Adverſary harbors a vain Suppoſition, That I joyn with the Church of *Rome*, that affirms, *That Baptiſm confers Grace.* If the poor Man had not been diſtemper'd in his Brain, or if he had underſtood *Engliſh*, he would not have had ſuch a Fancy of me; He would have known how to have put a difference between a Priviledge of Admittance into Chriſt's Church, and Spiritual Grace confer'd in Baptiſm.

He tells us next; This Invitation of Chriſt is a *Declarative of the Goodneſs of God to Infants, which Grace, no Infant ordained of God to ſo great a Bleſſing ſhall ever loſe by any real or ſuppoſed neglect of Men.* He tells us great News; That the Words and Command of Chriſt is a Declaration of the Goodneſs of God to Infants. Who doubts of it? The Queſtion is, what Goodneſs is here intended. Is there any other Goodneſs than the words import?

import, That Infants ſhould come to Chriſt to be made Subjects of his Spiritual Kingdom? And does not he appoint to them in this Order the means to obtain ſo conſiderable a Grace, namely by coming to him, that they may be received by him into it as Members of it? Was ever this Goodneſs of God declared to any other Infants, but to ſuch as were brought, or came to Chriſt? Or does he find in Holy Scripture any Infants ordained to ſo great a Bleſſing, but thoſe who were brought to him? Could ſuch as remain'd in the polluted State of Nature, in Original Sin, out of his Communion, pretend to any ſuch Bleſſing from him? To depend upon the Predeſtination and Ordination to an End without the preſcribed Means, is a *Fanatick* Madneſs, and *Antinomian* Principle. This is the perſuaſion of *R. Morgan*, and of the *Anabaptiſts* in their Confeſſion of Faith: Where they teach, That *Elect Infants dying in Infancy, are regenerated and ſaved by Chriſt through the Spirit*, &c. They have no Aſſurance in the Word of God of their Election, Regeneration, or Salvation, without a Compliance with the outward Means, which if we neglect, cauſeth us to fall ſhort of the promiſed Advantage. Therefore this ſuppoſition, with which our Adverſaries flatter themſelves is vain, idle, and unwarrantable, having no foundation in Holy Scripture, but proceeds from their wild and groundleſs Fancy. Nay, 'tis contrary

trary to the whole Current of the Word of God, and the manner of his Diſpenſing his Spiritual Bleſſings by Rules preſcribed to the Obedience of the Faithful. Thus the Carnal Defilements were removed by the Waſhings and Sprinklings of the *Moſaick* Law. The bitings of the fiery Serpents were healed by the looking up of the wounded upon the braſen Serpent. *Naaman*'s Leproſy was cleanſed by his waſhing Seven times in the Waters of *Jordan*. Likewiſe under the Goſpel, the Man born Blind had his Eye-ſight granted at the application of the Water of the Pool of *Siloam*. And does not our Bleſſed Saviour, in the caſe of Infants, as well as of the Adult, *Sanctify and cleanſe them as the reſt of his Church, by the waſhing of Water and the Word*? Epheſ. 5. 26. So the Apoſtle tells us, *Titus* 3. 5. That Children, and all his People, are *ſaved by the waſhing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*. Has God appointed any particular Method for their Salvation? Our Adverſaries muſt have a ſtrange Confidence to advance ſuch Doctrines, and impoſe them upon the Chriſtian World.

R. M. adds, *If Baptiſm were intended here, it would have been ſpoken of as well as his Bleſſing and his laying Hands on them.* That it was intended by Chriſt in this Order, left to his Apoſtles and their Succeſſors in the Church of God, is plain to be underſtood, and intelligible to all Orthodox Chriſtians enlightned

ightned and directed by the Spirit of God, nd obſcure to none, but the blind and ob-tinate *Anabaptiſts*, who wreſt the Scriptures o their own deſtruction, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. For ve have no other way now to bring our In-ants to Chriſt, but this, to enter them into is Church and Kingdom, the initiating Or-linance for them as well as the Adult. Therefore how dares my bold Anſwerer reflect upon this Interpretation of the Words of Chriſt, confirm'd by all the Fathers, and all the Chriſtian Churches of all Nations and Ages, that have look'd upon them and quo-ted them as their warrant to Baptize Infants, by ſaying, *'Tis Nonſenſe to inſer Infant Baptiſm from ſuch a Text?* Is *R. Morgan* only gifted with Senſe and Reaſon? We find no ſigns of theſe Endowments in his Pamphlet; neither doth he tell us where the Nonſenſe lies. Was the Author of the Conſtitutions pub-liſh'd under the name of *Clemens Romanus*, guilty of this *Nonſenſe?* For there we find theſe words, *l.* 6. *c.* 19. Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ νήπια, &c. Baptize your Infants, and Edu-cate them in the Diſcipline and Admonition of God; for ſaith our Lord, *Suffer little Children to come unto me and forbid them not, &c.* And *Tertullian* in his Chapter of *Bap-tiſm* runs into the ſame *nonſenſe*, by quoting the ſame Words of Chriſt by way of Objection for Infant Baptiſm, ſhewing that it was thus underſtood by the Chriſtian Church. To theſe I could bring all the Orthodox *Com-*

mentators

mentators upon the Word of God, who infer from hence the Baptiſm of Infants: Therefore to charge them all, and the Primitive Fathers with *nonſenſe*, is an Impudent Expreſſion, that never dropt from the Pen but of an *Anabaptiſt*.

R. M. ſaith next, That *the words were ſpoken for another purpoſe long before Chriſt's Death*. In good *ſenſe*, my Antagoniſt is reſolved to entertain us with falſe Notions two at a time: For in *Mark* 10. 33, 34. the ſame day that this Command was deliver'd to the Apoſtles in a Houſe, he went forth into the way, and was travelling towards *Jeruſalem*, Chriſt tells his Apoſtles, *Behold, we go up to Jeruſalem, and the Son of Man ſhall be deliver'd unto the chief Prieſts, and unto the Scribes, and they ſhall condemn him to Death*, &c. And by the other Evangeliſts, it appears that this Order was deliver'd to the Apoſtles at the latter end of his Miniſtry, ſome few days before his Crucifixion. And *that it was ſpoken to another purpoſe* than the words ſignify, is plain *nonſenſe* in *R. Morgan*. Would he make our wiſe Saviour guilty of *Equivocations* or *Mental Reſervations?* Or has *R. Morgan* ſo little ſenſe left in his Noddle, as to fanſie that Chriſt invites Infants to him to any other purpoſe, than that they ſhould come to him, to partake of the Bleſſings of his Kingdom, unto which he declares they have a Right to pretend? Or does he think to perſuade us any thing ſo contrary to Reaſon, and the expreſs Mind of Chriſt?

How

How well does my wiſe Antagoniſt anſwer my Appeal, let the Chriſtian Reader judge, *whether this Text is not much more intelligible for Infant-Baptiſm, than God's ſaying, I am the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob, *was to prove the Reſurrection of the Body from the Dead, and the real ſubſiſtence of Souls.* Without any reaſon given, and without diſcovering the diſparity of the Arguments, he boldly anſwers with a *Nonſenſical No*; and adds, *Should ſuch a Divine Logician draw the Conſequence from the Text in Controverſy for Infant-Baptiſm, we would heartily ſubmit.* I muſt tell him, what the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, which is directed by his Holy Spirit according to his Promiſe, concludes and infers from Scripture, is a Truth and Conſequence drawn by this Divine Logician. Now the preſent and Primitive Univerſal Church of Chriſt draws this Concluſion and Conſequence from this Text, as we do for Infant Baptiſm; therefore this Conſequence and Concluſion is a Truth drawn from this Text by this Divine Logician, and his Holy and Infallible Spirit. 'Tis very ſtrange, that our *Anabaptiſts* are ſo wilfully obſtinate, as to ſhut their Eyes to ſo plain a Text and Order of Chriſt for Infant Baptiſm; for if the Words were ſpoken at the time of his Departure out of the World, they were intended for the Benefit of ſome Children of the ſucceeding Ages; now as the E-

vangeliſts declare, they were ſpoken at the Time of his Departure, a few Days before his Crucifixion; therefore they were intended for the Benefit of ſome Children of the future and ſucceeding Ages. Again, if thoſe Children of the ſucceeding Ages, who by this Command are order'd to come unto Chriſt, have no other way preſcribed to them but Baptiſm, and are capable of no other Coming, they are without queſtion to be Baptized; but 'tis certain that they have no other way, nor are they capable of any other Coming: Therefore by the Order, by the Invitation, and Command of Chriſt, they are to be admitted to Baptiſm, and to come to him, and into his Chruch and Kingdom, by that initiating Ordinance.

2. Upon my ſecond Argument drawn from the Words, *Matth.* 28. 14. *Go and teach or diſciple all Nations, baptizing them,* &c. 'Tis remarkable that both we and our Adverſaries make uſe of this Text to juſtify our ſeveral Doctrines and Practices; we by obſerving the Word hath a double ſignification, and they by adhering to one. Now this is the general Commiſſion of Chriſt, by which he alter'd the Seal of the former Covenant, and inſtead of Circumciſion, appointed Baptiſm to be a ſtanding Ordinance in his Church, to introduce Proſelytes into his Holy Profeſſion. Tho' our Adverſaries draw from hence a perverſe and erroneous Concluſion againſt the Right of our Infants

to

to Baptiſm, all the Circumſtances of this Commiſſion plead for it. *Firſt*, Chriſt changes only the Seal of the Covenant, and without excepting any for their Nonage, commands to Proſelyte his Diſciples into his Religion by Baptiſm. 'Tis reaſonably to be preſum'd, that he underſtood thoſe who were formerly capable to be admitted, were not now to be excluded; and having diſcover'd but a few Days before his Gracious Intention to Infants, there was no need to mention them again in this Order. *Secondly*, The Seal that is appointed to ſucceed to the former, being taken from the Practice of the *Jewiſh* Church, that received the Proſelytes into its Boſom by Circumciſion and Baptiſm of Infants, as well as of the Adult, 'twas to be ſuppoſed without a Prohibition, the ſame Perſons who had formerly a Claim to Baptiſm, were not now to loſe it; for Infant-Baptiſm, as well as Infant-Circumciſion, had been the immemorial Practice of the *Jewiſh* Church; and our Lord approved of it ſo well, that he ſtampt upon it his Authority, and commanded the Continuance of it inſtead of Circumciſion. *Thirdly*, The Mildneſs and Excellency of the Covenant whereof it was to be a Seal, much more favourable than the *Moſaick*, were not likely to deprive Infants of a more eaſie and leſs painful Signature than the former, which they enjoy'd by the Divine Appointment. *Fourthly*, The Perſons unto whom this Commiſſion is directed, *Jews* ac-

quainted with all the Privileges of the *Jewiſh* Children, God's former Ordinance, and the Practice of the *Jewiſh* Church to admit Proſelytes by Baptiſm and Circumciſion, they muſt needs have the ſame Apprehenſions as to the Subjects of Initiation under the Goſpel, as they had under the Law. Without an Order to the contrary, when Chriſt order'd them to *Go and Diſciple all Nations by Baptiſm*, they muſt have underſtood their Commiſſion of Baptizing to have extended to Infants, as well as to actual Profeſſors; common Senſe muſt have dictated to them in this Caſe, to follow the Cuſtoms of their own Church, if there had been no Precept to the contrary. And, as a late Author very well obſerves, what Reaſon can any Man give, why he, who fetch'd ſo many of his Inſtitutions from *Jewiſh* Uſages, ſhould exclude Infants from Baptiſm, and recede in this Point from the *Jewiſh* Church? They are every way as capable of the viſible Signs of God's inviſible Favour, and of the Benefits of the Covenant under the *New Teſtament*, as they were under the *Old*; they are as fit Subjects of Baptiſm now, as they were of Circumciſion and Baptiſm then; their Initiation into both Churches ſeems to be equally Rational, becauſe, tho' the Sign of the Covenant be alter'd, yet the Covenant ſtill remains the ſame in reſpect to God. And there is no reaſon, why our wiſe Saviour ſhould lay aſide the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm; but on the contrary,

contrary, there is the ſame Neceſſity for its continuance, in reſpect of Infants that are poluted with Original Sin, and to diſtinguiſh the Children of Believers from thoſe of *Pagans*, and for all other purpoſes that inclin'd our wiſe God to appoint to them at firſt Circumciſion as his Seal. *Fifthly*, The Words uſed by Chriſt in this Commiſſion include Infants, as well as Perſons of riper Years: *All Nations*, without any exception, comprehend Infants, and the Word μαθητεύσατε, that ſignifies both to *Teach* and to *Diſciple*, relates to the Adult, who are to be taught and to Babes, who tho' they are not yet of an Age to be inſtructed, may be enter'd and enrol'd as Diſciples into Chriſt's School. By this Word of Two ſignifications both in *Greek* and *Hebrew*, or in *Syriack*, or in the *Galilean* Language, in which Chriſt deliver'd this Commiſſion to his Apoſtles, we may underſtand, that his Intention was, that Infants ſhould be received into his Church by Baptiſm, and diſcipled as well as their Parents. What ſays *R. Morgan* to this? He tells us, *'Tis a pretty way of arguing, to pervert a Text, and then to draw from it ſuch Conſequences as they pleaſe.* What an abuſive Reflection is this upon all Expoſitors of the Word of God, and Interpreters of the *Greek* Tongue, as if they perverted the Text, by rendering it *Diſciple all Nations*: It is ſo *Engliſh'd* by all that are acquainted with that Original Language, and ſo the

Greek Lexicons underſtand the Word. What a Spirit of contradiction muſt poſſeſs my Adverſary's Mind, to oppoſe the Judgment of all Men of Learning? I will mention only Three at preſent: Mr. *Gerard*, Μαθητευειν, ſaith he, is properly to make Diſciples by preaching the Word to the Adult, and by adminiſtring Baptiſm to Infants; And our Learned *Whitaker* tells us μαθητευσατε αυτῶς firſt belongs to Men of riper Years, and by vertue of the Covenant alſo to their Children; ſo likewiſe *Spanheim*, *Dub.* 27. ſaith, μαθητευειν *eſt Diſcipulum facere, non tantum docere, quod ſuo modo Infantibus aptari poteſt, quando etiam Parentes pro ſe & Familia Chriſto nomen dant.* Matheteuein *is to make Diſciples, not only to teach, but in ſome manner may be proper for Infants, when the Parents for themſelves and Family engage themſelves in Chriſt's Profeſſion.* Here are Three Perſons of excellent Learning, that mention this Word in that Senſe that I give it, and underſtand μαθητευειν to make Diſciples, as well as to Teach. But I cannot think my School-maſter, to be ſo ignorant as he ſeems to be, by ſaying, *I would do well to produce ſome good Author, who uſes* μανθάνω Manthano, *from whence* μαθητευσατε, *in any other Senſe, than to teach or inſtruct.* I perceive *R. M.* never conſulted his *Scapula* when he writ thoſe Words; for if a Boy in a *Grammar-School* did write ſuch, and ſo many Blunders and Falſities, he would be in danger of a Whipping, to mind him,

him, that μανθάνω ſignifies properly *Diſco, I learn*, and that μαθητεύσατε is immediately derived of μαθητεύω, which Word is *Engliſh'd* by all Men of the leaſt underſtanding in *Greek*, *I Teach*, or *make Diſciples*. To pleaſure my Learned Antagoniſt, I will ſend him to Two good Authors very well ſkill'd in their Mother Tongue, to *Plato*, who ſays, μανθάνω παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων, *I learn from others*; and to *Xenophon*, where he may find, if he can read *Greek*, μανθάνω ἱππεύειν, *I learn to ride*. Now μαθητεύω from whence μαθητεύσατε is derived as its proper Verb, ſignifies both *I teach* or *I diſciple*, or *make Diſciples*. So *Schmidius*, a Doctor of the *Greek* Tongue, interprets it on *Matth.* 27. 57. and ſo all the other Maſters of that Language render it. But can any Man of Reaſon, or any ſenſe of Religion, allow *R. Morgan* to call this Interpretation of all *Greek* Authors, and *Scapula's*, *a Cant*, and beſtow that ſcurrilous Title on the Sacred and General Commiſſion deliver'd by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, of *Diſcipling all Nations?* He and his Leathern Apron Treachers are ſo uſed to Whine and Cant for want of Senſe, that 'tis no wonder he makes uſe of that Word in this Place. I need not tell him what I mean by *Diſcipling*, Chriſt explains it, ſaying, *Baptizing them*, &c. But our Adverſaries will ſuffer none to be call'd Diſciples till they have been taught, contrary to the Uſage and Practice of our Country: For when a young Pupil is enter'd

into a School or University, from that time that his Name is enter'd into the Book, or he is received by the Master, he is reckon'd a Scholar, or Disciple, initiated to be instructed. For *Irenæus*, quoted by *R. M. l.* 2. *c.* 39. is not pertinent to our purpose. He disputes there against those who affirm'd, That Christ ended his Ministry after his Baptism in one Year; and proves, That he Preach'd, and continu'd during Three Celebrations of the Paschal Lamb teaching the People. *For how could he have Disciples, if he did not teach them?* He adds, *How could he teach, if he were not of the Age of a Teacher?* What is this to the discipling of Infants? for *Irenæus* speaks of Christ's Adult Disciples, that they were taught and instructed by him. If they had not been prevail'd upon by his Preaching to embrace his Doctrine, they could not be reckon'd his Disciples no more than the *Scribes*, *Pharisees*, *Pilate*, and the *Romans*, who heard his Teaching. Mr. *Stennet* labours to prove, That none can be made Disciples without a previous Instruction. We are for teaching Christ's Disciples, as well as our Adversaries; but we affirm, That Infants may be enter'd into Christ's School by the Ordinance of Baptism, and from that time nominated Disciples, when their future Instruction in the Principles of his Holy Religion is secured; and we are for admitting them betimes to the Honour and Privileges of Christ's Disciples. The Reasons he alledges

alledges to exclude them as the Text of *Luke* 14. 26, 27. and others are only proper to Adult Perſons, and have no relation to Infants. His Argument is very weak and improper to conclude from Chriſt's ſaying, That he that doth not prefer him before all other Carnal Intereſts, cannot be his Diſciple: That therefore Infants, who have no diſcerning Faculty to make choice of him, cannot be Chriſt's Diſciples; 'tis as if he ſhould conclude from St. *Paul*'s ſaying, 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 10. *That if any would not work, neither ſhould he eat*; That therefore becauſe Infants cannot work, neither ought they to eat. All ſuch Reaſonings of Duties and Practices appointed in the Word of God to Perſons of Diſcretion, conclude nothing in relation to Infants, to deprive them of their Privileges, becauſe they cannot perform them; God never required the ſame Conditions from them during their Infancy, as from the Adult.

For the primitive manner that he inſiſts upon, which was to begin by Teaching and Preaching the Goſpel, concerns not the State of Infants; we invert not the Order and Method which Chriſt hath eſtabliſhed, as he accuſes us. If we were to Diſciple the *Turks* or *Indians*, we ſhould begin by Preaching the Goſpel, as the Apoſtles did by perſwading them firſt to Faith and Repentance; and when they are convinc'd to make Profeſſion of it, to baptize them. But 'tis unreaſonable in our Adverſaries, to require, or expect Infants of Believers ſhould be treated in

that Order and Method: They are to be made Diſciples young, and have as great a Right to be Proſelyted to Chriſt in Baptiſm, as Children had to be proſelyted to God by Circumciſion under and before the Law.

Now if our Adverſaries would conſult and believe St. *Luke*, *Acts* 15. 10. they ſhall find there the Infants of believing and converted *Gentiles*, expreſly named *Diſciples*, without any previous Inſtruction: *Why tempt ye God*, ſaith *Peter*, *to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Diſciples*, *which neither our Fathers*, *nor we were able to bear.* What was that Yoke? 'Tis mention'd *ver.* 5. *That it was needful to circumciſe them*; now we all know that Circumciſion was confer'd on Infants at Eight Days old. This Yoke or Obligation to keep the Law was put upon them, who are there named *Diſciples*; and if thoſe Infants, whom the Superſtitious and Chriſtian *Phariſees* would have Circumciſed together with their Parents, could not be reckon'd *Diſciples* without firſt being Baptized, 'tis more than propable that they had been admitted to that Ordinance. And does not Chriſt declare, that whoſoever *receiveth ſuch little Children*, *receiveth him.* That *their Angels behold the Face of his Father*, *which is in Heaven*; *that 'tis not his Will that one of thoſe little ones ſhould periſh*, Matth. 18. Is all this proper to be ſaid of any but of Chriſt's Diſciples, Members of his Church and Kingdom? Is this applicable to thoſe, who continue in the poluted State of Nature, are out of

Covenant

Covenant with God, and in the Condition of Children of Heathens? 'Tis not probable that God and Chriſt ſhould have that regard for the Infants of Infidels, whom he elſewhere names Dogs. Now if our Adverſaries argue that none can be *Diſciples*, till they have been taught; we may, with the ſame falacious Reaſoning, conclude from *Mark* 16. 16. *Whoſoever believeth not, ſhall be damn'd.* That all Infants are certainly damn'd, becauſe they cannot actually believe. But as this Inference is falſe, tho' agreeable with the Letter of Holy Scripture, but not with the Intent and Meaning, ſo are all the Concluſions taken from thoſe Texts, where the Faith, the Repentance, and the Profeſſion is requir'd as Conditions from the Adult, in order to diſpoſe them for Baptiſm, when applied to Children by our Adverſaries; for in the former Text, the ſame want of Faith that excludes them from Baptiſm, excludes them alſo from Salvation. Therefore ſuch Expreſſions where the Order of Proſelyting Perſons of Ripe years, and their Qualifications are ſet down, concern not Infants; neither can any thing be reaſonably concluded from thence to their Prejudice.

The Third Argument he anſwers with Contempt, as if that were a ſufficient Refutation of all the Reaſons for Infant Baptiſm, commonly drawn from Infant-Circumciſion. This he calls with ſcorn, *A thread-bare Argument of Baptiſms coming in the Room, and inſtead*

ſtead of Infant Circumciſion. R. M. cannot deny but it does for the ſame purpoſe, to enter, ſign, and ſeal us as God's Covenanted People under the Goſpel, as the Family of *Abraham* were by Circumciſion under the Law. But he asks, *Whether it follows that it muſt have the ſame Subjects?* Why not? Can any *Anabaptiſt* give any Reaſon why Infants ſhould not be brought into Covenant with God under the Goſpel, as well as under and before the Law? Why ſhould they be excluded from that Privilege granted to the *Jewiſh* Children? Is there any incapacity in our Infants more than in the former? Or is there in the Inſtitution of Baptiſm any thing, that renders them now unfit Subjects of it? Are they not as capable to anſwer all the Ends of Baptiſm, as they were of Circumciſion? That was a Sign of God's Gracious Favour, and of their Right to his Protection and Mercy; ſo is this: That was a Seal of the Remiſſion of Original Sin; ſo is this: That was a ſolemn Reception into the Congregation of the Faithful; ſo is this. Their Infancy doth not hinder, but that they may be made Members of the Church of God, as of a Family, Tribe, or other Society; nor doth it render them incapable of being the adopted Children of God, any more than the Children of any other Perſon; nor of being Heirs of Eternal Life by virtue of that Adoption, than by virtue of any other Civil Adoption, the Heirs to a Temporal Eſtate; for

r Infants are capable of all acts of Favour and onour from God and Men, and of being inſta-d in all the Privileges of Societies, tho' they annot perform the Duties. And do they not-land in as much need of the Benefits of the ovenant of Grace as Men? In the *Ana-aptiſts* Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith, hey acknowledge it, namely, *Original Cor-uption and Guilt through the Fall of* Adam; but eny Infants any Remedy, which they allow o the Adult, namely, Baptiſm for the Re-miſſion of Sins; tho' Circumciſion was for-merly for the ſame purpoſe. And as Mr. *Cal-vin* obſerves, *l.* 4. *c.* 16. *Inſt.* when the *Anabap-iſts*, whom he there compares to *Wild Beaſts*, ind themſelves entangled with the reaſon-ble and unanſwerable Arguments drawn rom the Practice of Infant-Circumciſion, hey break through all Conſequences, and iſcredit the Concluſions with abuſive Ex-preſſions, as my Anſwerer doth. But does he think by calling this Argument *thread-bare*, hat he is able to ſatisfy our Judgments, and reduce us to a *Non-plus?* Can he baffle and anſwer all the Reaſons of Judicious Divines for the Continuance of Infant-Baptiſm taken rom Infant Circumciſion, with one ſcurri-ous Breath of his Mouth, or one Daſh of his injurious and ſcandalous Pen? None yet could ever give any ſatisfactory Reaſon, why Infants ſhould not be now enter'd into Cove-nant with God by Baptiſm, as they were by his Order formerly enter'd by Circumciſion,

as

as a Learned Divine obſerves; for if Baptiſm is ordain'd in lieu of Circumciſion, 'tis a Seal of the Goſpel Covenant, to be applied to all that belong to it. And if the Promiſes that appertain to this Covenant relate to our Children, and belong to them as the Holy Scriptures declare, they are, without queſtion, to be confirm'd and enter'd into it by this Seal of Baptiſm, this Sign of the Grace of God, and of the Benefits of our Redemption. To all my Reaſoning upon this *Topick*, which I ſhall not here repeat, *R. M.* is mute, but with his common Civility ſaith, *There are a great heap of Words to a ſmall degree of Senſe*; and adds, *The new Covenant is ſaid to come in the room and inſtead of the old, unto which belongs Circumciſion, and yet we muſt not argue, that therefore the new is a Covenant of Works, becauſe it follows that which was ſo.* I muſt confeſs *R. Morgan* has an incredible degree equally of Senſe and Civility, and a ſublimity of Reaſon above the Capacities of all other Men, to argue as he does. 'Tis as if he ſhould ſay, becauſe the New Covenant is not a Covenant of Works, it needs no Seal to be appropriated to it, nor is any thing required on Man's Part to be perform'd, but we are to be like ſo many Pieces of Timber and Stones brought into a Building meerly paſſive; That there is no need of being enter'd into it by any religious Ceremony appointed by God, and that the former Perſons who belong'd to the firſt Covenant are excluded from the Second.

Here

lere R. *Morgan* ſmells very rank of *Antino-ian* Principles, contrary to the drift of the ſoſpel of Chriſt; For is it reaſonable to hink, that becauſe God has been graciouſly leaſed to make with his People a New ovenant in Chriſt, eſtabliſh'd upon better romiſes, that there is no kind of Agree-ent and Conformity between the one and the ther? But let my wiſe Antagoniſt give me eave to inform him, that tho' the New Co-enant is not a Covenant of Works, which s a very ambiguous Expreſſion, and may be aken both in a good and an evil Senſe, 'tis a Covenant that requires our Obedience to the declared Will of God, and never intends to bring us to Heaven, without our concurrence, without our Faith and Compliance with his juſt and holy Laws, that are promis'd to be written by God in our Hearts; that this Obedience required under the New, makes it ſo far agreeable with the Old.

Now ſaith he, *So to argue, is of the ſame force as to argue from Circumciſion to Baptiſm.* I reply, That Infants, by God's Command, were to be Circumciſed at Eight Days old, and by that Sign and Seal dedicated to God, and enter'd into his Covenant; and that God having declar'd his good Will and Pleaſure in relation to thoſe innocent Babes in the *Old Teſtament*, and having never re-peal'd this Order of entering them into his Covenant; but on the contrary, having with anger forbidden the Miniſters of his Church

to

to exclude them, and graciouſly invited them to come to him in that Ordinance, that ſucceeds to Circumciſion, we may judge it an Impiety and Rebellion againſt God, as well as an injuſtice to the new born Creatures, to deprive them of God's Favour, and of their admittance into Chriſt's myſtical Body, which is his Church, as Members of it. Truly, did our Adverſaries weigh their Reaſoning upon this Point, they would find it very light; for they grant, that Infants were fit to be enter'd and engaged in the Covenant of Works, but not into the Covenant of Grace; as if they in their tender Age were capable of that, but not of this, a new and more favourable Covenant, that promiſes without Works to be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs, *Heb.* 8. 12, *&c.* He proceeds next to argue from the Lord's Supper ſucceeding to the Paſchal Lamb, and ſays, *That Infants did partake of the Lamb*; Why then do they not bring them to the *Lord's Table, as ſome of the Fathers did?* I anſwer, *Firſt*, I find not any Text in the old Law enjoyning Infants to eat of the Paſchal Lamb, as they are commanded to be Circumciſed. And doubtleſs ſome Infants were not able nor fit to be Partakers of it; none but ſuch were admitted, as could ask the reaſonableneſs of it, and be inſtructed in the Deſign of the Inſtitution, *Exod.* 12. 26, 27. And therefore to tell us, that *it is well known that Infants did partake of the Lamb*, is falſe, and not to be proved by any Scripture. *Se-*

Secondly, Baptiſm is a Seal of our New Birth, a Sacrament of Initiation to introduce Children into Chriſt's Church, without which their Salvation is doubtful: But the Lord's Supper is a Sacrament or Seal of our actual Faith and Obedience, and an open confirmation of our intereſt in God and Chriſt, and in the Merits of his Death and Paſſion. Is there any reaſon becauſe a Novice, or a young Stripling, may or ought to be admitted to the loweſt degree in Chriſt's School, therefore he muſt be advanc'd to the higheſt? Or becauſe a Child's Stomach can diſgeſt Milk, therefore we muſt adminiſter ſtrong Phyſick, or groſs Meats, proper only for Perſons of riper Years?

Thirdly, The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was inſtituted for a Commemoration of the Death of Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. For that purpoſe this Wiſe Saviour ordain'd it, *Do this in remembrance of me*, *Luke* 22. 19. Now Infants are not capable of inſtruction, nor can they anſwer the end, nor receive the benefits of that Sacrament, as they can of Baptiſm; where God treats them according to their Capacities, and by an admittance into his Covenant, grants them the remiſſion of original Sin, out of his free Grace, without any regard to their Merits, as he promiſeth *Jeremiah* 31. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 11, 12.

Fourthly, In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is a ſelf-examination required by St *Paul*; now as Infants are not capable of

of that Act of Religion, they cannot be admitted by that Rule of the Apoſtle; but to Baptiſm they may, where an outward Profeſſion and Engagement declared in their Names by their Sureties, is ſufficient for their Induction into Chriſt's Church; therefore *R. M.* is under a double miſtake, when he ſaith, *That whatſoever can be ſaid for Infants Baptiſm from Circumciſion, the ſame may be ſaid for Infants Communion.* All this is falſe, and Grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition; that Jewiſh Infants did all eat of the Paſchal Lamb.

Fifthly, Neither is there any ſuch neceſſity for their partaking in the Communion as for their Baptiſm; for by this Adminiſtration they are declared to belong to Chriſt, to be Members of his viſible Church, to be taken out of the corrupt State of Nature, and advanc'd by Baptiſm into a State of Grace; they are put into a fair way of Salvation; they may claim afterwards the Title, the Right and Privileges of Chriſtians, being dedicated to God and Chriſt in this Ordinance, inſtituted by their Redeemer for that purpoſe; but unleſs they be admitted, we have no aſſurance of their Salvation, nor do they appertain to the Redemption of Chriſt. Moſt of the Fathers judg'd Baptiſm ſo neceſſary, that they have Condemn'd all unbaptized Children to eternal Damnation, which we dare not do; but we ought to leave them to the infinite mercy of God, who has not declar'd himſelf, or his will in relation to them. But

we

we meet with no ſuch neceſſity in their Communion, till they come to years of diſcretion, being already within the Pale of the Church, and the Tuition of Chriſt and his Holy Spirit, unto whoſe Service they are at Baptiſm dedicated. Let therefore our Adverſaries ceaſe to upbraid us with this old, muſty, nonſenſical, and antiquated Objection, borrow'd from that Blaſphemous Heretick *Servetus*, burnt at *Geneva* for his Blaſphemies againſt the *Holy Trinity*. See Mr. *Calvin*'s *Inſtitutions*.

4, To my Fourth Argument drawn from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. the Holineſs of Believers Children, How abſurd and dogmatical does my Schoolmaſter appear! *What Holineſs ſoever is meant in this Text, I think*, ſaith he, *Baptiſm of Infants can't be inferr'd from thence:* That is, as if he ſhould tell us, I know not what Holineſs St. *Paul* underſtands: But let Infants born of Believers be never ſo *Holy* in the *Apoſtle*'s Judgment, let 'em be never ſo well diſpoſed and fit for a Dedication to God from the Womb, I don't think that they are to be Baptized, or that St. *Paul* intends it. Does *R. M.* fanſie his bare thoughts ſufficient to ſatisfy all Doubts, and ſet aſide all Reaſons and Arguments drawn from this Text, to prove Infant Baptiſm? His thinking faculty is ſo weak, and while 'tis ſo byaſs'd with his erroneous Opinion, we have no reaſon to value it, becauſe we have a cloud of Primitive Fathers and Orthodox Expoſitors, who think otherwiſe. But why does he think ſo? *Becauſe*, ſaith he, *if a Husband or a Wife be a believer*,

liever, then it gives a right not only to the Infants of ſuch a Believer, but alſo to the unbelieving Husband or Wife, and all their Adult Children.

Here *R. M*'s. Rational Faculty, is as infirm as his Cogitative; for the caſe is not alike here: All Adult Husbands, Wives and Children, ought to profeſs their own Belief before Baptiſm, before they can be Conſecrated to God; but from Infants born of Believing Parents, no ſuch thing is either required or poſſible, till they come of Age. They are indulged in their Weakneſs and Incapacity by the mercy of God, and their Sureties anſwering for them is accepted, becauſe they can't anſwer for themſelves; but 'tis not probable that the Faith or Holineſs of a Husband, or of a Wife ſhould intitle their unbelieving partners, and their Adult Children, Infidels, to the Kingdom of God, or to Baptiſm, the entrance into it, till they forſake their Infidelity and declare their Faith and Repentance, which they are able to do: There is in them an Indiſpoſition, that renders them incapable of ſo Holy a Society, while they are wilful Members of Satan and his Empire; but in Infants newly born, we meet with no ſuch indiſpoſition: Therefore the Faith and Profeſſion of their Believing Parents, or Sureties, may procure them a Reception by God's allowance into Chriſt's Kingdom by Baptiſm. The Goodneſs of God makes him thus ſeparate Children with their Believing Parents, from the reſt of the World, and look upon them as part of his choſen

hoſen People, by which they become rela-
ively Holy, and differing from unbelievers
Children. And anciently amongſt the *Jews*,
he Faith and Conſent of the Father, or of the
Witneſs or Godfather, and of the Congrega-
ion, where the Child was Circumciſed, was
elieved by them, to be imputed to the Child
s his own Faith and Conſent; ſo ſaith Mr.
eld. de Jure lib. 2. c. 2. They had good
Ground in the Scripture for this Opinion;
or if the Act of Parents, in neglecting the
Circumciſion of the Children, was reputed
heirs, as you may read, *Gen.* 17. 14. much
more their Act in bringing them to it, might
well be reputed as their Act and Deed.

Now when St. *Paul* Affirms, *That the unbe-
lieving Husband is Sanctified by the Wife, and
he unbelieving Wife is Sanctified by the Husband,*
Cor. 7. 14. is not to be underſtood only of
heir Converſion to the Chriſtian Faith, by
he Religious behaviour of the Believing
Partner; without ſuch a Converſion, the Title
of Sanctification cannot properly be allow'd
hem Perſons, while they continue in their
nbelief, as the *Apoſtle* ſuppoſes they do, and
et reckons their Children Holy. Therefore
conceive this Sanctification aſcribed by the
Apoſtle to the unbelieving Husband or Wife,
n conſideration of the Believer, is in relation
o the Children, and God's Right and Pro-
riety in them, by reaſon of the Prerogative
of the believing Seed. An Inſtance we have
n *Joſeph*, who Married *Aſenath* the Daughter
of

of *Potipherah*, an Idolatrous Prieſt of *On*, a Heathen Woman; yet *Manaſſeh* and *Ephraim* born to him before the years of Famine, *Gen.* 41. 5. were accounted a Holy Seed, becauſe their Father was in Covenant with God by Circumciſion, tho' the Iſſue of a Heathen Woman. But I ſhall examine this Text in the latter end of my reply to Mr. *Stennet*'s Book.

Some of the Fathers and Commentators judge, this *Holineſs* aſcribed to Infants of believing Parents, to be a declaration of their being Baptized aſſoon as they were Born, therefore they were named *Holy*, that is, of the number of Chriſts Diſciples, Members of his Church and Kingdom; for the name of *Saints*, and a *fœderal Holineſs*, is often in Scripture allow'd to the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity. According to this Interpretation, we need no other Proof from the word of God for Infant Baptiſm.

5. To the Fifth Argument taken from whole Houſholds mention'd to have been Baptized, *R. M.* makes no anſwer. But we have great reaſon to ſay, that as the Scripture declares, that entire Families were Baptized in the Apoſtles time, without any exception of Children, if we in our Days practiſe the ſame, and Baptize our Houſholds, we ſhall follow the Example of thoſe Primitive Chriſtians warranted in the word of God, and approved of by his Holy Spirit.

6. The Sixth Argument is borrow'd from *Acts* 2. 39. where St. *Peter*, after he had exhorted

horted the *Jews* to repent, and to be Baptized for the forgiveneſs of their Sins, ſays, *For the promiſe is unto you and to your Children.* *R. M.* confidently tells us, *That this promiſe was no other but the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, of extraordinary Gifts and Abilities, of Tongues, of Miracles,* &c. How ſuch a promiſe can be proper, and ſuit with the Age of Children, and how they who cannot ſpeak one Language, can have the Gift to ſpeak many, will puzzle *R. M*'s. thinking faculty to imagine and diſcover; neither can we find any ſuch promiſe made to Infants in the *Old Teſtament*; therefore St. *Peter*'s words relate to the former promiſe of God to Infants, *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will Eſtabliſh my Covenant with thee, and thy Seed after thee,* &c. *to be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after thee.* This promiſe agrees with St. *Peter*'s Exhortation, *Repent and be Baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins,* &c. They being all Adult Perſons, were call'd upon to repent of the Murder of Chriſt, and of their other Sins, and to be Baptiz'd into his Holy Profeſſion for the remiſſion of Sins: But when he comes to ſpeak of their Children, he enjoyns no repentance to them, who were not capable of it, neither did the Infants of that Age need it, being by their entrance into Covenant by Circumciſion releas'd from original Tranſgreſſion; neither had they been conſenting with their Parents to the Death of Chriſt; therefore to expect Repentance from them before Baptiſm was ridiculous,

diculous, and not agreeable with the Apoſtles Intention. But why does he mention here their Children? I anſwer, the Fathers were to Repent and to be Baptiz'd, and to bring their Children with them, or after them into the ſame Covenant and Profeſſion by Baptiſm, as the cuſtom of the Proſolyted Gentiles, was to carry with them their Children, to be partakers of the ſame federal Ceremony; for ſaith St. *Peter*, *The promiſe of Grace and Salvation, and of the Remiſſion of Sin, was to them and to their Children.* To Dream upon this Text of the Gift of Miracles unto Babes, is an extravagant fancy, that can never enter into the Brains but of ſome *Whimſical Anabaptiſt*; neither can we find in the whole *Bible* any ſuch promiſe made to them, but to Sons and Daughters, Adult Perſons, the Spirit was to be poured out, *Joel* 2. 8. *Eſaiah* 44. 3. ſuch a Spirit as their Age was fit to receive. God requires Repentance from none, but the Adult, guilty of actual Tranſgreſſions, and therefore want it. But Infants who never committed any Perſonal Sins, need nothing but the federal Mercy of God in his Ordinance, to releaſe them from their Primitive Guilt, and Tranſlate them from the polluted State of Nature, into a hopeful State of Grace. To tell us of our Churches requiring Repentance and Faith, as pre-requiſit to Baptiſm; 'tis to be underſtood from the Adult, as it declares. For the next Queſtion is, *Why then are Infants Baptiz'd, when by reaſon of their tender*

tender Age they cannot perform them? The Anſwer is, *Becauſe they promiſe them both by their Sureties, which promiſe, when they come of Age themſelves are bound to perform.* If our Adverſaries quote the Authority of our Church in one thing, they ſhould mention it for another, and be ſo fair in their Allegations, to not curtale the Text with a Suppreſſion of the principal part that condemns them. *R. M.* gives no manner of Anſwer to all the Arguments and Reaſons drawn from the words of St. *Peter* to the converted *Jews*, but vainly thinks he hath refuted Ten or Twenty Periods with one glance of his imagination, which he judges ſufficient; but the truth is, the following Pages are too difficult for him to meddle with: Truth appears there too plain, and ſhines too bright, for him to venture to obſcure it with his idle Exceptions; therefore he paſſes them over haſtily with a Thought, and pretends he hath ſaid enough, when he hath ſaid nothing to the purpoſe.

7. My Seventh is a Queſtion which I offer to our Anabaptiſts, What method they can propoſe to obtain or procure Salvation to their Infants dying before they come to riper years, otherwiſe than by Baptiſm? I have reaſon to propoſe this Queſtion to them, becauſe in their *Catechiſm* they acknowledge, *all Mankind by their Fall loſt Communion with God, are under his Wrath and Curſe, and ſo made liable to all Miſeries in this Life, to Death it ſelf, and to the pains of Hell for ever.* The

ſame Doctrine is taught in their *Confeſſion of Faith: Our firſt Parents by Sin fell from their Original Righteouſneſs and Communion with God, and we in them,* &c. *They being the root, and by God's appointment ſtanding in the room and ſtead of all Mankind, the Guilt of the Sin was imputed, and corrupted nature conveyed to all their Poſterity, deſcending from them by ordinary Generation, being now conceived in Sin, and by nature Children of Wrath, the Servants of Sin,* &c. This being the Condition of all Mankind, Young and Old, they allow a Remedy to the Adult, the Covenant of Grace by Jeſus Chriſt, and an entrance into this Covenant by Baptiſm, according to the preſcrib'd Rule; But what will become of the reſt of the polluted Offſpring defil'd with original Guilt and Corruption? Don't this Covenant belong to them? Are they to be excluded from an entrance into it? What Salvation can they expect for their Souls, if they dye in that deplorable State, before they be ripe enough for their Baptiſm? Is there any other name under Heaven given among Men whereby we muſt be ſaved but that of Chriſt? or is there any other method to be intereſſed in that name, but what he has appointed, namely, Baptiſm? *R. M.* falls again into his former Dream; that I joyn with the Church of *Rome*; What he means by ſaying, *I ask a queſtion for my ſelf*, I need ſome Expoſitor to inform me; for the Queſtion concerns them to anſwer. He ſaith, *The Queſtion needs no anſwer, but for the ſake of the Church*

of

of Rome, *who like himſelf teach, That Baptiſm confers Grace.* I am perſwaded that *R. M*'s. fancy is troubled with ſome Diſeaſe, that repreſents Men that are White as if they were Yellow or Green; or like that Man in the Goſpel, whoſe Eyes being half open, ſaw Men walking in the ſhape and appearance of Trees. I would willingly anoint his Eyes with a Salve, or with the Balm of *Gilead*, and out of Charity beſtow a Groats worth of Medicine upon him, that he may ſee clearer. He would find no ſuch Doctrine in my Book, That Baptiſm confers Grace *ex opere operato:* Therefore he might have ſpared his example of *Simon Magus* for ſome other Antagoniſt. But this Wiſe Man of *Gotham* pretends to inform me of the Doctrine of our Church, of which I have been a Teacher above Forty Years, as if I knew it not, *Sic Sus Minervam Docet*; and quotes half the Definition of a Sacrament, and with his uſual abſurdity thinks he hath met with me, by ſaying, *That if Baptiſm is the ſign of an inward and ſpiritual Grace, 'tis not the Grace it ſelf.* Very acutely argued, like a moſt Learned and Wiſe School-maſter. 'Tis as if he ſhould ſay, The Body of *R. Morgan* in a Sun-ſhiny day riding upon an Aſs, caſts a ſhadow upon the Ground, but the ſhadow is not the Man nor the Aſs; well ſaid, 'tis wiſely ſpoken. But I cannot approve of his mangling the definition of a Sacrament, and leaving out the eſſential part, namely, *An outward and viſi-*

ble ſign of an inward and ſpiritual Grace, given to us, ordained by Chriſt himſelf, as a means whereby we receeive the ſame, and a Pledge to aſſure us thereof. *R. M.* began the definition very well, but why does he break off? 'tis becauſe he will not allow Baptiſm to be a means whereby we receive the inward and ſpiritual Grace, nor a Pledge to aſſure us thereof: As if Chriſt's Ordinances were only inſignificant ſigns, unuſeful in the Church, and as if what is there repreſented were to no purpoſe, which Doctrine is next kin to Blaſphemy. I have already declared how far the outward Adminiſtration of Baptiſm is neceſſarily required in order to our Salvation; therefore I care not to trouble my Reader with needleſs Repetitions. 'Tis a means appointed by Chriſt, to declare our acknowledging of him, and his Holy Profeſſion and of our entrance in-his Church and Kingdom; 'tis an Inſtrument made uſe of by his Holy Spirit, to work upon our Minds, to Seal unto us the Pardon of our Sins, to confirm us in our Religion, and of his owning us for his People and Diſciples; Therefore St. *Paul* tells us, *That Chriſt Sanctifieth and Cleanſeth his Church by the waſhing of Water and the Word*, Eph. 5. 26. Again, *That God ſaveth us according to his Mercy by the waſhing of Water, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*; Both are required in order to our Salvation. To this Efficacy of Baptiſm agree the words of *Ananias* to St. *Paul* newly converted: *Now why tarrieſt thou, ariſe and be Baptized*

Baptized and waſh away thy Sins, calling on the name of the Lord. The real efficacy of this and the other Sacrament depends chiefly not upon the outward Elements, nor upon the viſible Actions; but principally upon the working of the Holy Spirit in the Souls of the Elect, and their Obedience and Faith concurring. This is to be underſtood in relation to the Adult, who are capable of Faith and Obedience: But the caſe of Infants is to be otherwiſe conſidered, as I have already taken notice. He ſaith next, *That the Sacraments are not neceſſarily conveyers of Grace to the Soul.* If he means by not neceſſarily, not conſtantly, then he ſuppoſes that ſometimes they are conveyers of Grace to the Soul; if that be his ſenſe, he ſeems to contradict himſelf. However he ſhould have let us underſtood, whether it were a Phyſical or Moral neceſſity of conveying Grace that he denies to the Sacraments; we deny the firſt as well as he; but I ſuppoſe that his aim is, that there is no neceſſity for the Sacraments to convey Grace, which he fanſies is beſtowed upon Infants without the Adminiſtration; to prove this Pernicious Aſſertion, if he could bring either promiſe or example out of Scripture ſince the Goſpel of Chriſt, *Magnus mihi erit Apollo.* God's Ordinances are to be complied with, and Baptiſm is not to be deſpiſed; without our Obedience to the Command of Chriſt none can expect the benefits there tendred to us, namely, Remiſſion

of Sins, entrance into Covenant with God, Admiſſion amongſt Chriſt's Profeſſors, Church membership, *&c.* So that tho' Baptiſm does not confer Grace, 'tis often confer'd unto us and to Infants in Baptiſm, by virtue of Chriſt's inſtitution and promiſe annexed to his Ordinance, and by the Mercy and Spirit of God, when we comply with his Orders and Command. Pray let him hear how well this Doctrine agrees with other Divines, *Buean.* in his *Loc. Com.* upon Baptiſm, ſpeaking of that Text, *Rom.* 8. 1. *There is now no Condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus*, ſaith, *That thereby we are to underſtand, that all Sins are pardon'd in Baptiſm, both Original and Actual.* He cites a paſſage out of St *Ambroſe*, *Gratia Dei in Baptiſmo gratis omnia condonat:* The Grace of God in Baptiſm freely forgives all things. This Doctrine is conſonant to God's promiſes, *Zechariah* 13. 1. *In that day there ſhall be a Fountain opened for Sin and Uncleanneſs.* I will add one paſſage here out of Mr. *Calvin*'s *Inſt.* l. 4. c. 16. v. 9. ſpeaking of the uſefulneſs of Infant Baptiſm, he ſays to thoſe who fanſy'd the Promiſe of God ſufficient to confirm their Salvation, *They who embrace the promiſe of the Mercy of God granted to their Children, let them remember that 'tis their Duty to ſign them with the Seal of that Mercy, and to bring them into the Church, and by that means to encourage them to a greater aſſurance, becauſe they plainly ſee the Covenant of the Lord applyed to the Bodies of their Children,*

dren, and the Children alſo receive no ſmall benefit from their Baptiſm; for they are thereby initiated into the Church, and are to be more conſidered than other Members. Afterwards, when they come to Age, they are thereby the more excited to a Serious and Earneſt Worſhip of God, becauſe they were by him receiv'd to the publick Seal of their Adoption before their Age would ſuffer them to know their Father. Finally, that threatning ought to terrify us, that God will puniſh every one that ſhall neglect to mark his Son with the Seal of the Covenant; becauſe by that contempt he ſcorns, and as it were renounces the Grace or Favour that is offered. Is this Famous Reformer of the Chriſtian Church a Papiſt, for ſaying, *That Children receive no ſmall benefit from their Baptiſm*, &c?

Now at laſt he comes to the Queſtion, which all this while he waved with his idle Suſpicion of Popery. The Queſtion, which he hath altered, is, *Since all new Born Children are not by Nature within the Covenant, by what means can they expect to become partakers of the Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt, otherwiſe than by his Ordinance of Baptiſm?* To this he makes no ſatisfactory anſwer, and leaves them to God's diſpoſal, and us in the Dark in relation to their future State, if they die without Baptiſm. 'Tis true, Chriſt hath ſaid, *That of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; but this was not ſpoken of any, but of thoſe who were brought to him, or who were to come to him in that method that he hath appointed in his Church for

their Reception; to theſe indeed he declares his gracious intention towards them with reſpect to Salvation; But where can we find that Chriſt hath revealed this gracious intention to Children, who were out of the Covenant; to the Infants of Heathens and Unbelievers, or to ſuch as are kept off from their participation of the Salvation purchaſed by Chriſt's Death? On the contrary, under the former diſpenſation God ordred Children to be cut off from their People, who had not the Seal of the Covenant within a prefixt time; he adds, *Let God apply Pardon to them in his own way*; And what is that way? We ſay, That way is revealed; for we are not left in the Dark in relation to Salvation either for our ſelves or Children: We have a method appointed for both, a ſure word of Prophecy. The Scripture plainly declares, That there is no Salvation but in God's bleſſed Son, *Acts* 4. 12. Our Infants muſt be related to him as well as our ſelves, if we expect Redemption for them or the remiſſion of Original Sin. No forgiveneſs to be expected from God without Chriſt, no admittance to Heaven without an Intereſt in this bleſſed Mediator, and great Steward of the Divine Favours, and eternal Bleſſings. Now he hath appointed Rules on earth for us to obſerve, to obtain a ſhare and intereſt in him and his Redemption, and to be initiated into his Myſtical Body, the Church. To expect any other way not revealed, or to hope for the benefits

Benefits either for our ſelves or Children, when we deſpiſe the Means, is an exceſs of Folly, Preſumption, Ingratitude and Madneſs; or to offer to diſpoſe of Salvation and Heaven to thoſe, who wilfully are excluded by their Parents neglect, or ſcorn of Chriſt's Inſtitution, is a Boldneſs not juſtifiable before God or Man.

R. M. proceeds on in the uſual Cant of his Sect, *That 'tis not likely that God ſhould venture their Salvation on ſo precarious a thing as Baptiſm, which may or may not be adminiſtred, &c.* This is after his wonted impertinent and irreligious Strain. 'Tis not God that ventures; for he hath preſcribed a Method for the Salvation of Infants, and may ſave them without it; but 'tis not ſafe for us to venture on that which is not revealed, and to neglect the appointed Method. He tells us next, *Seeing we have no Warrant from the Word of God to baptize them to this end*, &c. Here he returns to, and begs the former Queſtion. Is it probable that God in his Holy Word ſhould declare and diſcover a Method of Salvation for the Adult, and not for Children? and leave them in the corrupt State of Nature, without any Aſſurance or Means of Mercy, and Remiſſion of Original Sin? We ſay, and have ſufficiently proved, That we have a lawful and expreſs Warrant, and ſufficient Authority from Chriſt, to Baptize Infants, intelligible to all but ſuch as the Spirit of Error hath blinded their Underſtandings, that they

ſhould not perceive the Truth. We ſeek no other way to ſave our Children, and to remedy their Natural Corruption, but that which God and Chriſt hath appointed, to procure them an Intereſt in our Redeemer, and his Redemption, by a Viſible Introduction into his Covenant; To what he ſays, *That I have miſtaken the Place, That St.* Peter *joyns Repentance and Baptiſm together for the Remiſſion of Sins.* I anſwer, St. *Peter* ſpeaks to the Adult *Jews*, and enjoyns them to Repent and be Baptized; but when he aſcribes the Promiſe of the Covenant to their Children, there is not one Syllable of Repentance required from them, nor does he delay the Benefits of the Promiſe till they could Repent. Their Children being Circumciſed as probably they all were, they were within the former Covenant; they had not actually tranſgreſs'd, therefore they needed then no Repentance. But St. *Peter* declares, that by virtue of God's former Promiſe, they had a Right to the New Covenant, and therefore to the Seal of it, which was Baptiſm. But 'tis the common practice of our Adverſaries, to confound the State of the Adult with that of Infants: And 'tis a bold Venture, to delay the means of Salvation of Children till they come of Age, and keep them off from Chriſt, till they can make a perſonal Profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, when their Parents know not how ſoon Death may ſnatch them out of their Embraces. What will become

become of them when they die in the polluted State of Nature, is not known to us, nor any. Let not Parents hazard the eternal Welfare of their Little Ones upon ſuch Uncertainties not revealed, upon the Miſtakes and Miſapprehenſions of a deluded and new Sect, that proceeds from the Devil, to deceive Mankind and deſtroy Souls.

My laſt Argument is taken from the Words of Chriſt to *Nicodemus*, *John* 3. 5. *Except a Perſon, or a Man, be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* From whence indeed I infer the neceſſity of Infant-Baptiſm, in order to Salvation. In oppoſition to this Inference, *R. M.* produces the Comment of a Learned Man, who it ſeems was not altogether infallible; Mr. *Charnock*, a ſtiff and Zealous Diſſenter from our Church, and one whoſe Principles we judge not altogether Orthodox.

'Tis ſtrange, ſaith he, *that when all agree that the Birth ſpoken of here is ſpiritual and metaphorical, that the Water here ſhould be natural.* To reply to this Learned Man: All do not agree to what he ſays; And 'tis much more ſtrange, that this Spiritual Birth chiefly intended, and that requires by Chriſt's own Words, two neceſſary means or conditions, our Obedience to the outward Ordinance, and the ſpiritual Bleſſing, ſhould have but one in the Opinion of this Doctor, and that his Learning ſhould make our Wiſe Saviour guilty of Tautology. To underſtand this, and all other Texts of Holy

Holy Scripture, it concerns us to examine and weigh the Circumſtances: Chriſt, who put ſuch a Value upon *John*'s Baptiſm, becauſe it was of God, that he ſubmitted to it, reckon'd it part of that Righteouſneſs, that he was, and the *Jews* were, in imitation of him, bound to fulfil, was ſpeaking to *Nicodemus* a *Phariſee*, a Deſpiſer of *John*'s Baptiſm: When he was perſwaded by Chriſt's Works and Miracles, that he was a Teacher come from God, and therefore was deſirous to be inſtructed by him. The firſt Leſſon our Saviour recommends to him is, *To be born again*, without which Birth none can ſee the Kingdom of God; this Saying puzzled the Learned *Phariſee*, which made him ask, *How can a Man be born again, when he is old?* &c. for he apply'd the Saying to himſelf. Our Redeemer explains in the next Words, the Myſtery of this New Birth, and requires two neceſſary Particulars in the accompliſhment of it, Water and the Spirit; That is, the Baptiſm of Water, the Baptiſm of *John*, or an outward compliance and ſubmiſſion to that Ordinance, appointed by God for Men to uſe in order, and for the obtaining his inward Bleſſing, and a Diſpoſition fit for his Kingdom together with the Renovation of his Holy Spirit 'Tis not probable, that they who deſpiſe the one ſhould obtain the other; for 'tis to affront God's Wiſdom and Power, to neglect the outward Means allow'd and ſtamp'd by his Divine Authority:

Moſt

Moſt of the *Phariſees* were guilty of this Crime; for, *They rejected the Counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him*, Luke 7. 30. For this Reaſon Chriſt requires from *Nicodemus*, If he deſired to be admitted into the Kingdom of God, That he ſhould be born both of Water and the Spirit; that is, that he ſhould be baptized with Water, and ſanctified by the Spirit. That Phraſe is frequently uſed by the Primitive Fathers in that Senſe, they call Baptiſm a *Regeneration*, a *New Birth*; becauſe 'tis an Entrance into a New State, the State of Grace. Another Reaſon he alledges againſt this Interpretation: *None could be ſaved unleſs baptized, if this were meant of Baptiſm.* Several of the ancient Fathers were of that Opinion: But I anſwer, That God by theſe Words, tho' he binds us to the obſervance of his outward Ordinances, by which he is pleaſed to diſtribute his Spiritual Mercies, he is a free Agent, and binds not himſelf: Therefore, according to the ordinary Method or Courſe, none can be ſaved unleſs baptized: But God's Mercy can ſave them in an extraordinary manner unknown to us, upon which we are not preſumptuouſly to depend. He endeavours to confirm his Reaſon with the Text of *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* 'Tis unqueſtionable, that this eating and drinking is Spiritual, and not Oral; therefore there can be no juſt Compariſon between a Text

that

that requires Elemental Water, and the other a Spiritual Manducation and Food, perceptible only by Faith. For the other Text, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved,* contradicts his Expoſition, That *Chriſt lays not the ſtreſs upon Baptiſm; but upon Faith.* While both are required in our New Birth, according to his Confeſſion here, Why does he exclude Water, and mention only the Spiritual Birth by Faith and the Spirit? He tells us next, to invalidate the Interpretation by Water-Baptiſm, *That the Baptiſm of Water was not then a ſtanding Sacrament in the Chriſtian Church.* I anſwer, The Chriſtian Church was not then in being, while the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy continued, which laſted till the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, *Eph.* 2.14. *Matt.* 23. 2,3. And tho' the Baptiſm of Chriſt was not then in force, that of *John* was to be complied with by all God's People in the *Jewiſh* Church, to prepare them for the Reception of the *Meſſiah.* And what Chriſt ſaith in relation to *John*'s Baptiſm, ought with more reaſon to be underſtood of his own Baptiſm; for both were required in their ſeveral Times by the ſame Authority of our God. Again he ſaith, *Thoſe that underſtand it of Baptiſmal-Water, and ſo make it of abſolute neceſſity, do by another Aſſertion accuſe their own Expoſition of falſity; for they ſay, that the Baptiſm of Blood,* i. e. *Martyrdom ſupplies the want of Water.* We ſay ſo, when Water cannot lawfully be procur'd, and when 'tis

tis not deſpiſed nor neglected, and Perſons re hurried out of the World in a violent Perſecution, before they can be baptized, as ſeveral of the Ancients were. *'Tis Water*, ſaith he, *is expreſs'd, and Blood is not Water.* Who knows not what this Learned Expoſitor affirms? Therefore he confidently concludes, *that one of theſe Aſſertions muſt be falſe.* A pitiful concluſion from falſe Suppoſitions! We lay no ſuch neceſſity upon Water-Baptiſm as he conceives, as I have often ſaid; tho' God requires us to uſe the Means appointed, he can ſave with or without the Means, at his Pleaſure, and is not confin'd himſelf, tho' he confines us by his expreſs Command. If this Learned Commentator can reaſon no better, I deſire *R. M.* to keep him for himſelf, as his Oracle; we ſhall not conſult him in difficult Matters, nor follow his Expoſition that is falſe and ridiculous. Againſt ſo learned a Commentator I ſhall oppoſe the Expoſition of a more Learned Man: Dr. *Lightfoot* in his *Hor. Hebr.* p. 77. upon this Text: *Docet Judæum non intrandum in Regnum Meſſiæ, niſi primo per tranſitionem ex ſtatu Judaico in Evangelicum per Baptiſmum & dein ex Carnali in Spiritualem. Per aquam denotari Baptiſmum parum dubito*, &c. Chriſt teaches, that a *Jew* cannot enter into the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, unleſs he firſt paſſeth from the *Jewiſh* State to an Evangelical, by Baptiſm, and afterwards from a Carnal to a Spiritual. That by Water is ſigni-

ſignified Baptiſm, I make no queſtion. But my Antagoniſt goes on boldly, to tell us, *That 'tis certain Water is often in Scripture taken for the renewing, cleanſing, and refreſhing Operations of the holy Spirit.* But this is falſe, There are but few Texts where the Word Water is to be underſtood in a Spiritual Senſe, *John* 4. 14. for the ſaving Grace of the Spirit of God; but then there is always an Epithet, that diſtinguiſhes it from the common Water, for 'tis call'd a *living Water*, v. 10. and *John* 7. 78. *He that believeth in me, as the Scripture hath ſaid, out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of living Water: But this ſpake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him ſhould receive.* Water, without an Adjunct is cold and comfortleſs, and is ſo far from being a proper Metaphor of Joy and Comfort, that on the contrary 'tis more fit to repreſent Sorrow and Affliction, as *Iſaiah* 30. 20. And *Pſal.* 18. 16. *God drew me out of many Waters.* Therefore to take the Water of this Text in a Spiritual and Figurative Senſe, is a falſe and erroneous Expoſition, neither agreeing with the Deſign of our Saviour, nor the Context.

R. M. in the next place ſpies ſomething that he calls New and Strange, And what is it? *However, as the Intent of Baptiſm was to enter us into the State of Grace, and ſeal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour, it may with a great deal of Reaſon be ſtiled a New Birth, without any regard to the Birth*

Birth of the Spirit. Againſt this Doctrine my Learned Adverſary brings neither Reaſon nor Scripture to oppoſe it, but only his own erroneous Sentiments; and breaks out into an Eclamation, as if that were a ſufficient Refutation. Now to juſtify this Poſition, I wou'd ask *M.* What was the Intent of our Saviour, in this Inſtitution of Baptiſm, if not to enter us thereby into his Church and Kingdom? which is the State of Grace, I underſtand. Is it not to ſeal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour? For theſe Reaſons I conclude, that the outward Adminiſtration alone may be ſtiled a New Birth, or an Entrance into a New State; tis the Name that the Fathers, and ſeveral Modern Divines give to it. The Birth of Water, and the Birth of the Spirit ought to be unſeparable; but we find them diſtinct in the Word of God, and the one without the other. *Simon Magus* believed and was baptized, and continued ſometime with *Philip* in the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity; yet we cannot ſay of him, that he was born of the Spirit; his Hypocriſy will not ſuffer us to have ſuch a good Opinion of him: Yet he was admitted into the Fellowſhip of the reſt of Chriſtians, and by his Baptiſm was intituled at leaſt to all the outward Privileges belonging to them, and was enrolled amongſt the Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom by the Baptiſm of Water, tho' an unſincere and a falſe Profeſſor. Here outward Baptiſm ſealed to him many

many Advantages; therefore we may look upon him as one born of Water, but not of the Spirit. Did *R. M.* underſtand what Baptiſm is, he would not have been moved ſo to wonder, and quarrel at my Orthodox Hypotheſis. Let me inform him again, That 'tis a religious Ceremony of Initiation into God's Kingdom; a Sacrament appointed by Chriſt to ſeal to the Perſon admitted the Remiſſion of Sins, *Acts* 2. 38. and 22. 16. and thereby a Title to the Divine Favour. We cannot think the Adminiſtration is in vain, which Chriſt hath ordained; he is not wanting to his own Inſtitution, if we render not our ſelves unworthy of his Mercy. Now in Children we cannot find any thing that may be repugnant to the goodneſs of God, or may ſtop the Current of his Mercy promiſed to our Obedience to his Holy Ordinance; therefore we have Reaſon, as our Church teaches, to be perſwaded, that it takes them out of the State of Nature, and enters them into a State of Grace; ſeals to them the Pardon of their Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour, which is the New Birth that I mentioned. For the Birth of the Spirit, we find it without the outward Birth of Water, in *Cornelius* and his Company converted by St. *Peter*'s Preaching, *Acts* 10. *While* Peter *yet ſpake, the Holy Ghoſt fell on all them which heard the Word, and they ſpake with Tongues, and they magnified God.* Here is the Birth of the Spirit, before ever Water was ad-

miniſtred; yet the Apoſtle Judges it needful, that the other ſhould follow. *Can any man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we?* v. 47. And that R. *M.* may underſtand, that I deliver nothing but the Perſwaſion of our Church, let him conſult the Rubrick of Baptiſm, there he ſhall meet with Confirmation of this Truth that I maintain, which the Thirty-nine Articles more plainly expreſs. *The Sacraments ordained of Chriſt are not only Badges or Tokens of Chriſtian Mens Profeſſion, but rather they be certain ſure Witneſſes and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's good Will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us,* &c. And of Baptiſm we find theſe Words, *Baptiſm is not only a Sign of Profeſſion and Mark of difference, whereby Chriſtian Men are diſcerned from others that be not Chriſten'd; but it is alſo a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an Inſtrument, they that receive Baptiſm rightly, are grafted into the Church, the Promiſes of the Forgiveneſs of Sin, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God, by the Holy Ghoſt, are viſibly ſign'd and ſeal'd,* &c. I appeal to all Men of Reaſon, whether I vary one tittle from the Orthodox Faith of the Church of *England.* And Doctor *Featley* tells us from *Solinus*, of a River in *Bœotia*, that turneth Sheep of any Colour to be White, when waſhed in it, *That may be a Fable*, ſaith he, *but this is a Goſpel Truth. Such is the Vertue of this Conſecrated Water in Baptiſm,*

wherein

wherein Chriſt's Lambs are uſually waſhed thro
Divine Benediction in that Ordinance, that t
they were never ſo black or foul before, yet aft
they come out of the Water, they are moſt cle
and white, and ſo continue, till they plunge them
ſelves into the Mire of fleſhly Luſts. Pet
Martyr upon this Subject ſpeaks plain, *Cl*
4. Cap. 8. de Pado-baptiſmo. Whereas Chriſti
Infants are declared by the Word of God to hav
the Promiſe of the Covenant, and to be withi
the Church, this Participation and Promiſe i
ſealed to them by Baptiſm. Likewiſe *Wend*
linus in his Chriſtian Theology, *l.* 1. *cap.* 22
The principal End of Baptiſm is to ſignify, t
ſeal, and ſacramentally to repreſent the Remiſſio
of Sins, Regeneration, and our Union wit
Chriſt, as alſo conſequently a Mutual Union o
the Baptized. I will add one Paſſage mor
out of Mr. *Baxter's* Book againſt Mr. *Tombs*
in his Preface concerning Infants Church-
Membership: *Signs cannot by Moral Operation*
be Inſtruments of a real Change on Infants, bu
only of a Relative. And a little after: *Tho*
Infants are not capable of every Benefit by Baptiſm,
as are the Aged, yet they are capable of th
Principal Ends: That it may be a Sign to enter
them Church-Members, and ſolemnize their De-
dication to Chriſt, and engage them to be his
People, and to take him for their Lord and Sa-
viour; ſo to confer on them Remiſſion of Sins,
and what Chriſt by the Covenant promiſeth to the
Baptized; yet tho' themſelves underſtand not this,
even as we put the Names of Infants in Bonds
and

Leaſes, which they can neither read nor know.
And Mr. *Charnock*, an Author approved
my Antagoniſt, ſaith on *John* 3. 5.
eneration is the Myſtery and Senſe of the
red Ceremony. 'Tis indeed ſignified, repre-
ted, and ſealed in Baptiſm, how he does not
ermine. Therefore is this the New and
ange Doctrine ſo frightful to *R. M.* that
ſo agreeable with the Belief and Perſwa-
n of all other Orthodox Divines of all
ts and Diviſions?

For the Names of *Godfathers* and *God-*
thers I have ſet down in divers Languages,
ſhew what eſteem other Nations have of
t ancient Cuſtom, as old as the *Jewiſh*
urch, by the Honourable Titles that they
ow upon thoſe Charitable Friends, who
eſent Infants to the Baptiſmal Font, that
h of our Sectaries, who have aboliſhed this
us and Godly Practice, may underſtand
w they differ, not only from our eſtabliſh'd
urch, but alſo from all other Orthodox
urches in the World. 'Tis not to make
y Oſtentation of my Knowledge in thoſe
ngues, as *R. M.* vainly and maliciouſly
roaches me.

Concerning the Word βαπτίζω, *R. M.* is
a *Non-plus* about my meaning, when I
rm that its natural ſignification implies a
er Dipping or Waſhing than βάπτω, and is
quently underſtood in a larger Senſe by
Maſters of the *Greek* Tongue, and in the
ord of God, for any kind of Waſhing,
Sprink-

Sprinkling, or Cleanſing, where there is
Dipping or total Immerſion. This I am
prove, and *R. M.* waits for my Explication,
he ſays; for he tells us, that *he knows no* Gre
Author, that uſes the Word in any other ſenſe th
to dip or plunge, and ſo to waſh by ſuch dipping.
am partly of his Opinion in one thing, *That*
knows no Greek *Author*, &c. For I believe
never read any, neither underſtands t
Language; if he had, he would never ha
told us that μαθήτευω ſignifies to teach; a
would have been more skill'd in the Practi
of the Schools, and known how to diſtingui
between a Scholar and a Maſter, betwe
Learning and Teaching. But as my Task
to prove, by ſome approved *Greek* Autho
that βαπτίζω ſignifies to ſprinkle, I will deſi
him, or ſome intelligent Perſon in th
Tongue, for him, to conſult *Euſebius*, *Lib.*
Cap. 20. or in the *Paris* Edition 23. whe
he ſhall find a young Man converted b
St. *John*, committed to the Tuition of
Biſhop, who ſome time after baptized him
but he returning to his former Trade of
licentious Life became a Captain of Thieve
and forſook his Tutor. When St. *John* ca
to require him of the Biſhop, he underſtoo
of his Relapſe into the ſame diſorder
Living, which cauſed him to ſeek him ou
to reclaim him. The Thief at the ſight
St. *John* fled from him; but being perſwad
by the Apoſtle's kind Invitation to dra
nearer to him, with Promiſes of Pardo

e embraced the old Man, and anſwer'd s well as he could for weeping, *So that again e ſeem'd to be baptized with Tears.* Can any Man make ſenſe of theſe Words, by under-ſtanding the Word baptized again, for plunged or dipt with Tears? 'Tis impoſ-ible to take this Expreſſion but for Sprink-ing in a primary Signification, and for waſhing in a ſecondary and conſequential. Now here are Three Arguments deducable rom this Text, to prove the Word *baptizo* o ſignify, *I ſprinkle:* Firſt, none can be ſaid o be plunged or dipped with Tears, or in Tears, but only ſprinkled with Tears; for he Eyes cannot afford ſo vaſt a quantity to mmerſe the whole Body. Again, when the irſt Baptiſm is compared by the Author to his ſprinkling the Face with Tears, 'tis an evident Teſtimony, that the firſt Baptiſm was perform'd without dipping, in a manner ſomething anſwerable to this ſecond Baptiſm, which is to be underſtood of Sprinkling, and not of Dipping; otherwiſe the Author's Compariſon had been defective, and not pro-per. But there is another Argument, that the next Words afford to prove the Mode of Bapiſm was then by Sprinkling; for 'tis ſaid, That the Thief *ſeem'd to be baptized again with Tears.* Μονὴν ἀποκρύψαντων τὴν δεξιὰν, *The Right Hand only omitted or conceal'd.* Does not this Expreſſion plainly diſcover how Baptiſm was perform'd by the Chriſtians of thoſe Days, by the Hand of the Miniſter, who was to ſhake

ſhake the Water upon the baptized Perſons; and conſidering his Face, how 'twas beſprinkled with Tears; *Euſebius* affirms, That he ſeem'd to be again baptized with Tears, the Office of the Miniſter, or the Right Hand, that ſhould have baptized him, only omitted. How can any dipping be here underſtood? I appeal to all Men of reaſon to judge of this Quotation, whether this *Greek* Author does not repreſent this Thief's Baptiſm without Immerſion, or plunging over Head and Ears; a Practice not uſed at firſt but by the ſuperſtitious *Jews*, and by ſuch Chriſtians as were fond of, and imitated their Actions and Cuſtoms, as we ſhall take notice elſewhere.

I undertake not to juſtify the Truth of this Relation, I am only to obſerve the Expreſſion of this *Greek* Author, who underſtands Baptiſm for Sprinkling in this Text. And it may deſerve our Obſervation, that divers Verbs in that Language ending in ἴζω, are the diminutives of other Verbs, as παίω, I ſtrike in earneſt, παίζω, I ſtrike in Jeſt, and in ſport, as in Children's play: σέβω, I adore, σεβίζω, I worſhip with leſs reſpect: ὠθίζω, I drive ſoftly, from ὠθέω, I drive with more violence; νοσσίζω, I ſeparate a little, from νόσφι aſunder; νομίζω, I judge or eſteem, in a diminutive ſenſe. So likewiſe from βάπτω, I plunge, or immerſe, or Dip, is derived βαπτίζω, which ſignifies a leſſer waſhing, or application of Water by ſprinkling or otherwiſe.

But

But I have that Kindneſs for my Adverſary, tho' he is uncivil, to gratify him with another Quotation; and if he deſires, with many more out of good Authors, to prove, that Καθίζειν ſignifies to ſprinkle, as well as to dip, and a leſſer waſhing than Λούω, the Radix of Καθίζω In the 6th Book of *Euſebius*, *c.* 42. he ſhall find there, in a Letter of *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, to *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, that *Novatus*, when he was like to dye *was Baptized in the Bed where he lay:* How can this ſick Man be plunged or dipped over Head and Ears in Water, when he lay in his Bed? If Baptiſm did always ſignify Immerſion, ſuch a one could never be ſaid to be Baptized. Some indeed have obſerved, that *Cornelius* ſeems to diſapprove of this manner of Baptizing; but if we examine the Hiſtorian, we ſhall find the cauſe of his diſlike, was not becauſe he had not been dipped, but becauſe he obtain'd not, after his Recovery, that which he ſhould have had according to the Canon of the Church, to wit, Confirmation by the Hands of the Biſhop. I know that they who deferr'd their Baptiſm till a Sick or a Death-bed, were ſeverely reproved by the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and noted with the Title of *Clinicks*, not becauſe Aſperſion or Affuſion of Water, was not a ſufficient Baptiſm, for it was the approved Cuſtom of thoſe Times in ſuch Caſes; but becauſe thoſe faint hearted Chriſtians were loth to leave their Vices,

and engage themſelves to obſerve the exact Rules of Chriſtianity, till the latter end of their Days, hoping then by Baptiſm to obtain the full forgiveneſs of all their former Sins. The ſcandalous Lives of thoſe Men, occaſion'd the Canon to be publiſh'd, That ſuch ſhould not be admitted into Holy Orders, without great neceſſity; and not becauſe they were Baptized by ſprinkling, as Biſhop *Taylor*, quoted by Mr. *Stennet*, ſeems to intimate; for it appear'd by deferring Baptiſm till the laſt Moment, as they ſuppoſed, that they were unwilling to lead a regular Life, and to forſake their beloved Sins. Neither doth Mr. *Stennet* fairly repreſent that Quotation; for he leaves out the Principal Cauſe of his Exception, the Omiſſion of Confirmation by the Hands of the Biſhop, according to the Canon. I might add divers other Examples of Confeſſors and Martyrs, Baptized in Priſons and in Chains; theſe were all ſprinkled, as *Laurentius* and *Lucillus*, and a Number of others mention'd in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories; for they had not the Conveniency of Pools, Baths, Ponds or Rivers, to perform the Ceremony in their Confinement, nor is it probable that their Heathen Keepers would allow them the free Liberty to perform their Chriſtian Ceremonies. Likewiſe if we inquire into the Method of Baptizing publickly the *Catechumeni* in the Face of the Primitive Congregations in divers Churches, it was not by dipping the whole Body,

Body, but by pouring of Water upon the Face, or by dipping the Head and Face into the Font; for that purpoſe we read, they hang'd their Head over it for to perform this Immerſion: Therefore yet at *Jeruſalem* is to be ſeen a little Stone Font, in poſſeſſion of the *Syrians*, which, as Tradition informs, was uſed by the Holy Apoſtles in Baptizing Men and Women, as Mr. *Henry Maundrel*, Chaplain to the Factory of *Aleppo*, tells us in his Journal, *Page* 98. Therefore this Ancient Monument, where 'tis not poſſible to dip the whole Body, agrees not with a Total Immerſion, which Mr. *Stennet* affirms to be the conſtant Uſage of the Primitive and Modern Churches of the Eaſt. And St. *Chryſoſtom* repreſenting the Mode of publick Baptiſm uſed in his Time, ſaith, *The old Man is buried and drown'd, when we plunge the Head in Water, as in a Sepulchre.* On *John* 3. 5. Mr *Stennet* purpoſely omits this plunging of the Head in Water, in the *Engliſh* Verſion, tho' he cites it in *Latin*, Page 153. For this ſhews, tho' Dipping or Immerſion was uſed in the Primitive Times by ſome Churches, I cannot find any Example in all the Ancient Records, of a Total Immerſion of the whole Body in the ſight of the Publick Congregation, where the *Catechumeni* were uſually Baptized; for it had been an unſeemly Sight, if ſo many young Men, Virgins, and others of the Female Sex, had been Baptized or Plunged into the Water naked or half naked, in the Pre-

ſence of ſo many Eyes. The Practice had been too ſcandalous and immodeſt for any civil People, whatever the Patrons and Advocates of the *Dipping-Sect* may pretend; and doubtleſs ſome of their Enemies would have taken notice of it, and interpreted that Practice to their Diſadvantage and Diſgrace, and left it upon Record. If any uſed a total Immerſion, it cannot be proved to be the Univerſal Practice of the Eaſtern Churches of Chriſt, nor is it admitted amongſt the *Abyſſines* to this Day. If it had been an Apoſtolick Tradition, there it had continued without controul, for that hot Country can have no Excuſe for the omiſſion or change of Dipping the whole Body into Aſperſion, which is now their conſtant Uſage at Baptiſm. If Naked Men and Women muſt thus promiſcuouſly appear publickly before a Congregation, to be Immerſed over Head and Ears, they muſt firſt renounce all Modeſty. If cloathed, tho' with a thin Garment, 'tis their Habit that is, by Dipping, to ſpeak properly, Baptized, and not their Perſon, as *Voſſius* obſerves: *Baptiſmus non eſt Immerſio Veſtium, ſed humani Corporis:* Baptiſm is not the plunging of the Garments, but of the human Body. Here we may obſerve, that this Word *baptize*, which I have proved to ſignify Sprinkling, is not employ'd in the Word of God in any common Uſe, but either in a Religious or Superſtitious Practice, and where the Power and Mercy of God is to exert

exert it ſelf, who wants not the Quantity of Water, nor that Circumſtance of Dipping, to produce the deſir'd and promis'd Effect.

Again, We may obſerve in the *Latin* Fathers, they frequently uſe the Word *Tingere*, to expreſs the Action of Baptiſm, which anſwers to the Verb *Baptizein*, and ſignifies a ſlight Dipping or Touching of the Water, not a total Immerſion, as ſome Idolaters of Dipping fanſie; or elſe it ſignifies to dye, or alter the Colour or Property. Then it relates to the Spiritual Efficacy and Benefits of that Chriſtian Laver, where the Soul is Totally Immerſed and Dyed in the Blood of Chriſt; witneſs the Words of *Gregory*, Biſhop of *Rome*: *Baptiſma Græco eloquio dicitur quod Tinctio quia ibi Homo Spiritu Gratiæ in melius immutatur & longe aliud quam erat efficitur; Primum enim fœdi eramus deformitate peccatorum, in ipſa Tinctione reddimur pulchri dealbatione virtutum:* Baptiſm in *Greek* is the ſame as *Tinctio* in *Latin*, for there a Man is chang'd for the better, and becomes altogether another Perſon, before we were defiled with the Pollution of Sins; but in this Laver we are render'd Beautiful or Clean, with the Whiting of Chriſtian Vertues. In this Quotation my Antagoniſt may take notice, that this excellent Chriſtian and Orthodox Biſhop, Sirnam'd *Thaumaturgos*, a Worker of Miracles, who abhorred the Title of Univerſal Biſhop, aſcribes more to Baptiſm than I do,

and yet is not for the *Opus Operatum* of the preſent Church of *Rome*. Truly, all the Primitive Fathers, when they ſpeak of Baptiſm, extol the efficacy of it through the Grace of God, by naming it, *Illuminatio*, *Enlightning*, *Regeneration*, *New Birth*, &c. Therefore my Adverſaries need not be ſo much offended at my ſaying, That the outward Adminiſtration of Baptiſm is to be born again of Water, ſince this Doctrine is taught by Chriſt and the Catholicks of all Ages and Nations.

But methinks, the Proofs that I have alleged to convince him, That the Word Baptize is uſed in another Senſe than Dipping or Plunging, ſhould be ſufficient to perſwade him, a Truth ſo evident and ſo well agreeing with the Texts of the Word of God, which he judiciouſly deſpiſes, and which he muſt give me leave again to examine. In *Mark* 7. 4. 'tis unreaſonable to fanſie any Dipping: The *Jews* indeed were very ſuperſtitious in their Waſhings and Cleanſings with Water, as the *Mahumetans* are to this Day: They were very nice to purify all Parts of their Body with that Element. But can any rational Perſon think, that they proceeded to that Degree of Superſtition in all Times and Seaſons, in Winter as well as Summer, in Froſt and Snow, as often as they came from the Market, to dip themſelves over Head and Ears in Water, Men and Women, with their long Hair, before their Dinner: Their Heads

Heads could not be dry in half a Day, and by ſuch a Practice they might have endanger'd their Healths. Beſides, 'tis to be conſider'd, that divers Towns and Houſes had no ſuch Conveniency of Water, being ſituated upon Hills, and were forced to ſupply themſelves from Wells and Fountains at a diſtance, as *Bethulia* in *Judith*, and a City of *Samaria* call'd *Sychar*, *John* 4. 5. and others. Neither could every Dwelling have a Pond, or a Bath convenient for ſuch a Purpoſe: Therefore this Expoſition of our Adverſary's is altogether improbable, if not abſurd and ridiculous. I confeſs with Mr. *Beza* and Mr. *Pool*, that ſometimes βαπτίζεσθαι may be more than χερνίπτειν, to waſh the Hands; they muſt give me leave to diſſent from them in ſome Particulars, where they diſſent from the Holy Scripture. For I ſuppoſe they waſhed their Faces, their Eyes that had ſeen the ungodly, their Feet and Legs, and all naked Parts expoſed to the Infection and Polution of the Common People; the reſt of their Body was defended and cover'd by their Garments. This I judge to be the Meaning of the βαπτίζονται of that Text, which I prove by *Peter*'s Saying to Chriſt, *John* 13. 9. *Simon Peter ſaith to him, Lord, not my Feet only, but alſo my Hands and my Head.* Why ſhould he mention the Waſhing of his Hands and his Head only, and not his other Limbs, but that it was the common practice of the *Jews* to baptize and purify thoſe naked Parts

of their Body, at their return from the Markets. This Expoſition agrees with what is ſaid, *John* 2. 6. That at the Marriage of *Cana* of *Galilee*, *There were ſix Water-pots of Stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or Three Firkins a-piece.* No Man of Senſe will imagine that they were for Dipping or Plunging the Perſons of the Houſe over Head and Ears: It was impoſſible that they could be totally Immerſed in ſo narrow a Compaſs: Yet theſe Water-pots were there for the ſame purpoſe, to baptize them who came from abroad, and purify them according to their general Cuſtom. So likewiſe we are to underſtand, *Luke* 11. 38. when Chriſt was invited to a *Phariſee's* Houſe to Dinner, *He went in and ſat down to Meat. And when the Phariſee ſaw it, he marvelled,* ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου, *that he had not been baptized or waſhed before Dinner.* Can any Man of ſenſe underſtand this Word *ebaptiſthe* in the Original, to be Dipped over Head and Ears, as Mr. *Stennet* would always have the Word baptized, turn'd into *Engliſh*: 'Tis truly almoſt as ridiculous to imagine, as the Practice would ſeem ridiculous to Men of Reaſon, that any People were arrived to that Degree of Superſtition, to plunge themſelves in Pools and Ponds at every time they eat Meat; they rather waſhed their Faces, their Eyes, Hands and naked Limbs. This is expreſs'd in Holy Scripture by the Word *Baptizing*; for a Total Immerſion cannot here be

be underſtood. And it is likewiſe remarkable, to undeceive our Adverſaries, when any Dipping is ſignified in the *Old Teſtament*, in the *Septuagint* the Word *Baptizein* is not employ'd, but *Baptein*, to dip as *Exod.* 12. 22. λήψεσθε δὲ ὕσσωπον καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, &c. *And ye ſhall take a Bunch of Hyſſop, and dip it in the Blood, that is, in the Baſon*, &c. So *Levit.* 4. 6. καὶ λαβὼν ὁ ἱερεὺς βάψει τὸν δάκτυλον εἰς τὸ αἷμα. *The Prieſt ſhall dip his Finger in the Blood.* And *Luke* 16. 24. 'Tis the Rich Man's Requeſt to his Father *Abraham*, to ſend *Lazarus*, ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος &c. *That he might dip the Tip of his Finger in Water*, &c. Many other Texts might be alledged out of the Word of God, to prove, that when Dipping is to be expreſs'd, the Verb βάπτειν, not βαπτίζειν, is frequently uſed. Therefore Dr. *Lightfoot* expounds the former Words of *Luke* 11. 38. in this manner, *That the Dipping of the whole Body is not to be here underſtood, may be proved ſufficiently; becauſe ſuch a Dipping was not practiſed, but where there was a Defilement from the Principal Cauſes of Uncleanneſs.* In another place of his *Hor. Hebr. Baptiſm is not always to be interpreted Dipping, ſomethings were to be dipped, others to be waſhed, others to be ſprinkled*, Hor. Hebr on *Mark* 7. And if we may interpret one Text of Holy Scripture by another, we may find out the Meaning of St. *Luke*'s Word *Ebaptiſthe*, by the *Phariſees* Reprehenſion of Chriſt's Diſciples, *Matth.*

15. 2. *Why do thy Disciples transgress the Tradition of the Elders? for they wash not their Hands when they eat Bread.* This was the Cause of the *Pharisees* wonder, when he saw that *Christ* neglected this Tradition of the Elders, which is expressed by ὁ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.

7 I would willingly inform the fond Idolaters of Dipping at Baptism, That there are divers *Greek* Words in the *Septuagint*, and in the Writings of the *Apostles*, used in a Sense not altogether agreeing with the Heathen Authors, but suitable to the Purpose of the Spirit of God. We may again observe, that Words often change their signification in a few Years: For example, The Word *Tyrannos* in the ancient Authors, is an ordinary Word for a *Prince* or *Governour*, and was not then offensive; but now 'tis a Name of Disgrace, and is become odious to all Mankind. So formerly, in our *English* Dialect the Word *Knave* denotes a Servant or a Foot-boy. In the Days of *Henry* the Eighth, in *Tindal's* Translation of the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Romans*, we read, *Paul the Apostle, and Knave of Jesus Christ.* Therefore since Words alter their signification in a few Years, we are not to seek for the true sense of Words used in Holy Scripture from *Hesiod*, *Homer*, *Demosthenes*, *Isocrates*, and other Heathen Authors, or from *Scapulas* and *Lexicons*, that are their Interpreters, and discover the various Acceptations of Words; but

but from the *Holy Scripture*, where, by comparing one Text with another, we may find out the true meaning of the Spirit of God. For that Reaſon, tho' this Word βαπτίζειν may be ſometimes taken in thoſe ancient Authors, and in our Dictionaries, for Dipping; 'tis otherwiſe underſtood by the *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, and in the Evangelical, and Apoſtles Writings, for ſome thing leſs; for Waſhing and Sprinkling where there is no Dipping, as I have already proved.

Now from the Beginning of *Geneſis*, to the End of the Revelations, and in all the Apocryphal Books, I challenge our Adverſaries to name one Text, where this Word βαπτίζειν ſignifies indiſputably *Dipping*, without a Poſſibility of taking it in any other Senſe, or is ſo underſtood by the Spirit of God; nor do I find it interpreted *Dipping*, by our *Engliſh Expoſitors*, but in the Caſe of *Naaman* the *Syrian*, 2 *Kings* 5. 14. in the *Septuagint* is ἐβαπτίσατο ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ ἑπτάκις κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Ἐλισαιέ. *He baptized himſelf Seven times in* Jordan, *according to the Word of* Eliſha; tho' our *Engliſh* Verſion renders it, *He dipped*; if you look into the former Verſes, you ſhall find this Baptizing in *Jordan* Seven times, expreſſed by the Verb λούω, *I waſh*, as Verſ. 10. Πορευθεὶς λοῦσαι ἑπτάκις ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, *Go and waſh Seven times in* Jordan. And Verſe 12. *Are not* Abana *and* Pharpar, *Rivers of* Damaſcus, *better than all the Waters of Iſrael*, οὐχὶ πορευθεὶς λούσομαι ἐν αὐτοῖς, *may I not waſh in them and be clean?* So Verſe 13. his Servants prevailing upon

upon him to try the Remedy, that the Prophet had preſcribed, uſes the ſame Word λοῦσαι, *waſh*, for *baptize*. Now ſince the Spirit of God in the ſame place, interprets the Word ἐβαπτίσατο, by *Waſhing*, and our Expoſitors by *Dipping*; To which Interpretation have we the greateſt Reaſon to incline? For *waſhing*, expreſſes ſomething more than *Dipping*, and not the ſame Act of plunging under Water, namely, the rubbing with the Hand in Water the defiled part. And if we inquire into the *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Word uſed by Chriſt in his Commiſſion to his Apoſtles, *To go and baptize all Nations*, we ſhall find that it ſignifies to *Sprinkle*, as *Doctor Lightfoot* obſerves. Chriſt ſpoke to them in one of theſe *Eaſtern* Languages, the Word is מבילת *Tebilah*, from the Root מבל, which as *Pagninus* ſays, is uſed for *Tingere*, *Mergere*, *Lavare vel Baptizare*, for Dying, Dipping, Waſhing, or Baptizing. And Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critica ſacra*, renders it, *Tingendi aut abluendi gratia demerſit, ita Lavit, ut res non mundetur, ſed tantum attingat humorem, vel tota vel ex parte, baptizavit:* He dipped with a purpoſe to die, or waſh; He waſhed in ſuch a manner, that the Thing was not cleanſed, but that it might touch the Water, either in Whole or in Part; He Baptized. It ſeems theſe are the ſeveral Interpretations of the Word *Tabal*; where the Chriſtian Reader may take notice of the Wiſdom of our Redeemer, in expreſſing his Order in ſuch Terms as might

autho-

authorize both Sprinkling and Dipping at Baptiſm, and allow to his Diſciples the Liberty of uſing either Cuſtom. Therefore to require Dipping as the only lawful Mode at Baptiſm, is a great Error, proceeding from a Miſunderſtanding both of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Words in theſe Original Tongues, and of the true Intent and Meaning of Chriſt.

But I quoted a plainer Text of Holy Scripture, that calls Sprinkling Baptiſm, *Heb.* 9. 10. of which *R. M.* tells us, Learned Men are not agreed how it does accord with what goes before. I ſuppoſe his Learned Men are his *Blue* and *Leathern-Apron Teachers*, who cannot endure to hear that Baptiſm ſignifies Sprinkling. But does the Authority of God's Word depend upon the Agreement of ſuch Learned Men? Here is an expreſs Text of Scripture to prove Sprinkling a lawful Baptiſm, and that the Apoſtle underſtood this Word for Sprinkling. Yet *R. M.* has the Confidence to aſſirm, that theſe divers Baptiſms mention'd by St. *Paul* out of the *Levitical* Law, *were divers Dippings as the Word ſignifies.* If this were true, it had been an odd kind of Purification, very improper, and unlikely to be plung'd over Head and Ears in Blood; beſides, *divers Dippings* is nonſenſe, for there cannot be different kinds of Dipping, the Act being always the ſame. Now we find Two or Three Expreſſions commonly uſed by *Moſes*, *Sprinkling*, *Waſhing*, and *Bathing*, the firſt with Blood, or Water, the

the two latter being Synonymous, expreſs the ſame Action and Performance, *i. e.* Waſhing or Bathing in Water. Theſe and no other are the *Divers Baptiſms*, διαφοραῖς βαπτισμοῖς mention'd by the Apoſtle. The Word *Divers* ſignifies, different Kinds in the manner and Ingredients: We read indeed of dipping the Prieſts Finger in Blood and in Water, and dipping the Hyſſop and Scarlet Wooll in the Blood of the ſacrificed Bird or Beaſt, to be applied afterwards by Sprinkling to the Perſons or Things, that were deſign'd to be Purified and Cleanſed; but in the *Greek* and *Septuagint*, the Verb there always uſed, is not *baptizein*, but *baptein*, which ſignifies to dip or plunge. Now I don't think *R. M.* ſuch a Noddy, to interpret the divers Baptiſms of St. *Paul* to be the Dipping of Hyſſop, Scarlet Wooll, and the Prieſt's Fingers in Blood or Water; for 'tis to be underſtood of the Application of them to the Perſons, either by *Bathing* or *Sprinkling*, or to the things that were to be ſanctified, the Deſign of theſe divers Baptiſms being for the Purification from ſome Uncleanneſs. And that Method was appointed by God for that purpoſe, and render'd effectual to anſwer the End by God's Grace, Power, and Mercy. Now 'tis nonſenſe to apply it to the Inſtruments, to the Prieſt's Finger, or to the Hyſſop or Scarlet Wooll, what was intended for the Sanctification of

Perſons

Perſons or Things: Therefore in all the *Moſaick Law*, we read of no Dipping or Plunging in Water, enjoyned for any Purification of Perſons or Materials, but only *Sprinkling*, *Waſhing*, or *Bathing*. Now the two latter Words being often expreſſed by the Verb λούω, in the *Septuagint*, and ſignifying the ſame kind of Baptiſm, there cannot be *Divers Baptiſms* found in all the *Levitical Law*, unleſs we take Sprinkling for one, in reference, either to the Ingredients, which were either Blood or Water, or to the Baptiſmal Actions, which were *Sprinkling*, *Waſhing*, or *Bathing*. And 'tis to be noted that *Sprinkling*, which was moſt times perform'd with Blood, was the moſt valuable, and always requir'd, when there was a treſpaſs againſt God. The Law of Purification by *Waſhing* or *Bathing* in Water, is ſet down in *Levit.* 15, 16, 17. Chapters, and in *Numb.* Ch. 19. v. 19. But that of *Sprinkling*, is oftner mention'd, *Exod.* 24. 8. *Levit.* 6. 27. and 8. 11, 30. and Ch. 9 12, 18. and *Numb.* 19. 13, 20, 21. The ſame kind of Baptiſm we may find practiſed in the Days of *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* 29. 22. *The Prieſts received the Blood, and ſprinkled it on the Altar*, &c. Of this Mode of *Sprinkling*, for the Sanctification of God's People, St. *Paul* ſpeaks, *Hebr.* 9, 18, 19. *The firſt Teſtament was not dedicated without Blood. For when* Moſes *had ſpoken every Precept to all the People, according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and of Goats*,

Goats, with Water, and Scarlet Wooll, and Hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the Book and all the People &c. *Moreover he ſprinkled with Blood both the Tabernacle and all the Veſſels of the Miniſtry. And almoſt all things by the Law are purged with Blood, and without the ſhedding of Blood there is no Remiſſion.* The word in the Original καθαρίζεται, *are purged*, is an Interpretation of *Divers Baptiſms*, and for what Purpoſe they were ordained. For as it imports Purifying or Waſhing, it ſignifies the Effect and Deſign of the *Sprinklings* of *Moſes*'s Law, to waſh away the Carnal Defilements from the Fleſh, and the Spiritual from the Mind, by God's expreſs Command, repreſenting to the Faithful the Blood of a more valuable Sacrifice, with which they were to be ſprinkled, and their Conſciences purged and freed from all Apprehenſions of the Divine Juſtice. Now theſe *Sprinklings* are reckon'd amongſt the *Divers Baptiſms* of the Ceremonial Law by St. *Paul*, in the fore-named Text. And as thoſe *Moſaick* Ordinances were Types and Figures of the Doctrines, Practices and Precepts of the Goſpel, and as they were ſufficient only by *ſprinkling* of Blood or Water, and ſuch a ſlender Application to anſwer the End for which they were appointed, namely Sanctification to the Purifying of the Fleſh, how much more efficacious ſhall the Blood of Chriſt be, when it is any ways applied unto us in his Ordinance of Baptiſm, tho' by the Sprinkling and Affuſion of Water, to anſwer

ſwer thereby the gracious Purpoſes of Divine Wiſdom? And are not the frequent *Sprinklings* under the Law, a ſufficient Vindication of our Practice under the Goſpel, of appropriating the Thing ſignified to the Perſons concern'd, namely, the Blood of Chriſt by the *Sprinkling* or *Affuſion* of Water upon the Face, the ſame Thing having been often ſignified, and repreſented to the Faithful *Iſraelites*, by the ſame Action, by God's Command, and the Blood of Chriſt typified by the Blood of the Sacrifices.

My Learned Adverſary having nothing more to ſay upon this Subject, refers us next to Mr. *Stennet*'s Anſwer to Mr. *Ruſſen*; doubtleſs a more formidable Antagoniſt, whom he calls to his Aſſiſtance. He might have ſent us before to this judicious and learned Author; for he borrows from his Book, much magnified by his Party, all his Quotations, and his crude and indigeſted Notions, which we cannot name Reaſonings: But what ſaith that Learned Man for his fond Practice of Dipping? No more than what has been formerly written by others for the ſame Cuſtom. To examine every Paragraph of the Sixth long Chapter, liable to exception, would ſwell a Volume too big for our Purpoſe; I ſhall therefore reduce all his Learning there contained to Five Arguments, with which he labours Tooth and Nail, to eſtabliſh *Dipping* as the only Mode of true Baptiſm. And if I anſwer them with leſs Learning, and

fewer

fewer Quotations, it ſhall be with more Truth and Sincerity on my ſide.

The firſt is the Command of our Saviour Chriſt, and the Primitive Inſtitution, which he gathers from the Meaning he gives to the word Βαπτίζειν *to baptize*, which he ſays ſignifies properly and primarily to dip or immerſe in VVater.

The Second is the Practice of *John the Baptiſt*, of Chriſt and of his Holy Apoſtles, which he affirms did always baptize by Dipping.

The Third is the Uſage of Primitive Antiquity, of the *Greeks* and *Muſcovites*, and other Nations, who obſerv'd, and do yet obſerve this Mode of Dipping at the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm.

The Fourth is, That the Uſe and Deſign of this Holy Inſtitution, being to repreſent the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and a Chriſtian's dying to Sin, and riſing to newneſs of Life, makes this Mode of Adminiſtration appear, not only proper, but neceſſary, *Page* 120.

The Fifth is the Judgment of divers Perſons of Figure and Learning, whom he muſters up, and who votes for Dipping at Baptiſm.

To the firſt I anſwer, That Mr. *Stennet* is miſtaken, when he affirms, that Βαπτίζειν ſignifies only to dip or plunge properly, and to waſh only by conſequence; for I have made it appear this Word ſignifies in the Adminiſtration

ſtration of Baptiſm, to ſprinkle. We are not to be altogether govern'd by *Lexicons* and *Scapulas* in our Judgment of Original Words, but by the Authors from whom the Compilers of Dictonaries fetch their right ſignification; and tho' the Word *baptize* may in the *Greek* Authors imply a Dipping or Plunging, yet, ſeeing in the Word of God St. *Paul* reckons the Sprinklings of *Moſes*'s Law amongſt his divers *Baptiſms*; and both *Euſebius* and *Socrates*, approved *Greek* Authors, and many others, eſteem the Affuſion of Water a ſufficient Baptiſm, and ſo underſtand the Word, we have no reaſon to judge *Dipping* to be the only approved Mode of this Adminiſtration; or that Chriſt commanded it to be always practiſed in his Church, and to prefer the Obſervance of that Rite to the Lives of Men, Infants, and the weaker Sex; for whatever ſome Phyſicians may advance to recommend *Cold Baths*, and perſwade the Dipping in over Head and Ears to be harmleſs, 'tis ſufficiently known that all Conſtitutions are not alike, and what may be beneficial to ſome, may be prejudicial to others. I could here bring ſeveral Tragical Examples of the late pernicious Effects of Dipping naked Perſons in cold Water: Mr. *Slate* of *Lyons-Inn*, chill'd his Blood and haſten'd his Death, by this Practice, according to the Judgment of two of the moſt eminent Phyſicians Dr. *D——x* and Dr. *H——s*. And my late Friend

Dr.

Dr. *H—mfr—le*, became a Cripple by the Uſe of cold Baths. Doubtleſs many tender Perſons cannot bear the Sharpneſs of the cold Water in the hotteſt time of Summer, much leſs in Winter; and do any think that Infants are able to endure what Perſons of Maturity cannot ſuffer? Such Baptiſms agree neither with the Wiſdom nor Goodneſs of God, whoſe Orders tend to the Preſervation of the Lives, as well as the Souls of his Creatures. I cannot but give here a Relation atteſted for a Truth by a very good Author, of a certain *Anabaptiſt Teacher*, who held a Perſon in Dipping ſo long under Water, after he had caſt him upon his Back, that the Perſon was ſtifled, and died immediately; whether it was not in his power to reſcue him from the Danger, is not ſaid; for the Party being in that helpleſs Poſture, upon his Back, could not ſo ſpeedily get out before his Breath was gone: But to excuſe the Murder amongſt the Zealous Brethen, *You ſee*, ſaid he, *that a Man is no ſooner newly born, but God takes him to himſelf.* I appeal to ſome, who have been Dipped by thoſe Deceivers, Whether they have not been in hazzard of their Lives by ſuch a Practice? And 'tis not probable that our Wiſe Saviour, who was to ordain a Sacrament of Initiation into his Church, for the Uſe of all Nations, in all Climates, and for all ſorts of Tempers and Diſpoſitions of Body, and for all Seaſons of the Year, would command the Practice of a Rite, that might carry

rry many of them to their Graves, as ſoon they enter'd into his Profeſſion. Therere in the firſt Inſtitution he orders his Apoſtles, *to go and Diſciple all Nations by Baptiſm*; which ſignifies not only to dip, but to prinkle, leaving it to the Diſcretion of the veral Churches, to practice that which is oſt convenient for their People. Our Adverſaries are greatly miſtaken, when they, in heir Confeſſion of Faith, declare, *Immerſion Dipping in Water neceſſary to the due Adminiſtration of his Ordinance*; as if Chriſt had nex'd his Bleſſing, and the Benefits of aptiſm to ſuch a Quantity of VVater, or to he outward Act and Practice of Dipping. he Application of VVater is what is required, and to the Face the moſt proper Part f the Body to receive this Application. Vere Baptiſm deſign'd by Chriſt for the eanſing of the Body, we ſhould then be of ur Adverſary's Opinion, and vote for the ipping the whole Body in VVater; but as he Sacrament is chiefly for the Sanctification f the Mind, and the cleanſing the Soul from he Spiritual Pollution of Sin and Iniquity, a eſſer Quantity of VVater applied to the erſons, may be ſufficient to ſignify and ſeal o us the Benefits there intended by our erciful Saviour, as well as Rivers and the ea; beſides, I would have our Adverſaries, ho contend ſo much for Dipping at Baptiſm, o conſider, that the Act of Baptizing, is the wful Miniſters Act and Deed by Chriſt's Appoint-

pointment. VVhen therefore he applies a ſmall quantity of Water to the Perſon, and pronounces the words commanded by our Lord, and in his name he Baptizes the Perſon, he needs not communicate nor diffuſe the Water to every part and Member, but only to the Face, the moſt proper place, the Window of the Soul, where that inward and ſpiritual being is moſt viſible to us, and appears to the Eye by divers Characters, for whoſe ſake and benefit Baptiſm was chiefly ordained. And 'tis to this ſprinkling at Baptiſm that St. *Peter* alludes, 1 *Peter* 1. 2. *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through Sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and ſprinkling of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.* What means the Apoſtle by this obedience and ſprinkling of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, but that they were made partakers of Chriſt's blood by their obedience to his Ordinance; and the ſprinkling uſed at that time, to convey to them a right to his Blood and Paſſion, when they engaged themſelves in his Religion. And doubtleſs the Apoſtle alludes to the *Levitical Baptiſms* mention'd by St. *Paul*, of ſprinkling the Blood of Beaſts and Birds ſacrificed to God: Which were all Types of the Blood of the Son of God, and which is by his own Command applied unto us by the ſprinkling of the Baptiſmal Water in his Ordinance to ſanctify and purge us from Sin. In the ſame Language St. *Paul* ſpeaks to the ſame *Jews*, *Heb.* 12. 24. *ye are come to Jeſus*

the

he Mediator of the New Covenant. How were hey to come, but by Baptiſm the firſt ſtep f their coming to Chriſt? *And to the Blood of ſprinkling*, an *Hebrew* Phraſe inſtead *of Blood prinkled.* How and where was it ſprinkled ut in their Baptiſm, by the ſprinkling of Water that repreſents the Blood of Chriſt, hich Blood ſpeaks better things than that of *Abel*; for it not only pleads for, but confirms the Remiſſion of their Sins, who were here entred into Covenant with God. This mode of ſprinkling in Baptiſm is promis'd by *Ezek.* under the Goſpel Diſpenſation, *c.* 36. *v.* 25. at the return of the *Jews* into their own Land: *Then will I ſprinkle clean Water upon you, and ye ſhall be clean,* &c. *and a new Heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the Stony Heart out of your Fleſh, and I will give you a Heart of Fleſh, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my Judgments and do them.* Here is the Birth of Water or Baptiſm expreſs'd by ſprinkling, and the Birth of the Spirit which God promiſed to the *Jews* in the latter days; therefore let our Adverſaries deſiſt from alledging the Command and Inſtitution of Chriſt for Dipping, for their ſuppoſitions are falſe, ill-grounded and erroneous, and not agreeing with the mind of Chriſt, nor the Current of Holy Scripture, nor the right interpretation of the Word *Βαπτίζειν* in this caſe.

Mr.

Mr. *Stennet*'s ſecond Argument for Dipping, in which he ſeems to Triumph over Mr. *Ruſſen*, is drawn from the Circumſtances of the Adminiſtrations of this Ordinance, by *John* the *Baptiſt*, by our Saviour and his Holy Apoſtles Recorded in the Holy Scripture, which he ſays, does abundantly confirm Dipping in Baptiſm. The Circumſtances that he fanſies makes for h s purpoſe, are the plenty of Water where *John Baptiſt* Baptized, then going into the River *Jordan* and other Brooks. Their coming out again as it is expreſly ſaid of Chriſt, *Matth.* 3. and of the *Eunuch*, *Acts* 8. What do all theſe Texts make for Dipping? Indeed it is ſaid that our Saviour was Baptized by *John*, and the *Eunuch* by *Philip*; but unleſs the word did always ſignify to plunge or dip, which it does not, I underſtand not how Mr. *Stennet*, with all his Wit and Learning, can conclude, that either of them were dipped over Head and Ears, as he would perſwade us, and to uſe his own Terms; Does he think the Fictions of his Brain are good proof in a matter of this Conſequence, that is ſo prejudicial to the Honour and Religion of the Reformed Churches? And that his ſuppoſed probability will ſatisfy the Judgment of any rational Man, or the Conſcience of any ſerious Chriſtian? Could not Chriſt and the Eunuch go into the Water to be Baptized without being Dipped? 'Tis not ſaid they went under, but into the Water. Our Adverſaries, who require

require plain Scripture for our Belief and Practiſes, ought to give us the ſame Scripture for their erronious Principles and Cuſtoms, if they would have us receive them. And for the Plenty of Water where *John* was Baptizing, he choſe thoſe places, becauſe there was Water at all Times and Seaſons of the year, in that dry Country or Wilderneſs, for the conveniency of ſuch as came to him to be Baptized; but to argue from the plenty of Water in *Jordan*, that the Multitude were dipped over Head and Ears in it, I ſee no reaſon to believe it, unleſs Mr. *Stennet* could produce ſome other proof, than the word *Baptize*, which as I have proved, ſignifies the application of Water by ſprinkling, without dipping or plunging. This agrees with the deſcription that Travellers give of the River *Ænon*, which is but a Rivulet that a Man may ſtride over, commonly not ſo large, and ſcarce as deep as the leaſt Streams of Water that run through the Streets of *Salisbury*, to which Mr. *B.* in the 12th Chapter of *Infant Church Membership* agrees. 'Tis not propable, and perhaps not poſſible to be dipped or plunged in that ſhallow Stream. And for the *Eunuch*, 'tis not likely that, being upon his Journey towards his Country, he was dipped in Baptiſm; for beſides the Circumſtance of his Travelling, that Region between *Jeruſalem* and *Egypt* is dry, hilly, and ſandy, having nothing but ſmall Rivulets, which in the Summer, for the moſt part,

are dryed up. If we may believe *Fuller*'s Miſcel. p. 205. He was Baptized at a Spring which ariſes at the Foot of a Mountain near *Bethſoron* and *Boteſhellah*, where 'twas impoſſible for him to be dipped; but if he were dipped, he was either Naked or with his Garments on; if the latter, 'twas to be termed a ſteeping or ſoaking of his Body in Water, and the dipping of his Cloaths rather than a dipping of his Perſon: If he was required to be Naked, 'twas an act of immodeſty, that might have diſcourag'd him from ſuch a Profeſſion, that reduces Men and Women to loſe all ſenſe of Shame, and Rules of Chaſtity and Decency. And if we may give Credit to the ancient Pictures of the Baptiſm of Chriſt and of his Holy Apoſtles, we ſhall find them ſtanding upright, and ſo Baptized and Baptizing, and not Dipping or Dipped under Water. He brings a Text of *Acts* 22. 16. where *Ananias* ſpeaks to *Saul* newly converted; *And now why tarrieſt thou, ariſe and be Baptized, and waſh away thy Sins.* Which Mr. *Stennet* would have interpreted, Be dipped and waſh away thy Sins; And why not Be ſprinkled and waſh away thy Sins? For 'tis not the quantity of Water, nor the Action of Dipping that hath ſo great an influence upon the Mercy of our God, or the Conſciences of Men, to waſh away Sins; but the Divine Bleſſing that can Operate with a few Drops as well, and as efficaciouſly, as with the Waters of a whole River. Truly if we

Examine

examine the mode of Dipping practis'd by ſome of the Anabaptiſts; we ſhall find it very ſcandalous, contrary to all Civility, Modeſty and good Manners, and very ridiculous. The Dipper leads the Party into the Water half Naked, others have a thin Garment to cover them; the Dipper takes the Party by both Hands, and lays him or her upon the Back, flat in the Water over Head and Ears, and then pulls the Party out again. Others take the Perſon to be dipped by the Poll, and douce or plunge their Heads under Water. Others have dipped the Parties Naked. For all the Anabaptiſts, who inſiſt ſo much for dipping at Baptiſm, are not agreed about the true and ancient mode; but vary very much in their Practices. What Pranks and Acts of Uncleanneſs the Dippers are guilty of with ſome of the Female Sex, after they have been plung'd by them, divers have witneſſed; but with what certainty I cannot tell. Beſides many inconveniences and ſcandals may happen by ſuch a Naked Dipping. See Mr. *Baxter*, *c.* 13.

The Third Argument Mr. *Stennet* produces for his beloved practice of Dipping, is the uſage of the Primitive Antiquity of the *Greeks* and *Muſcovites*, and other Nations, who obſerved, and do yet obſerve this mode of dipping at the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm. I may without offence here make uſe of Mr. *Stennet*'s words, *Their practice is no Rule to us unleſs we could be ſure theſe Nations*

were infallible; we ſhall not be ſecure in following their ſteps any farther, than they follow'd thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: And tho' their common practice was, and is to dip, unleſs Mr. *Stennet* can prove, that they never make uſe of affuſion, ſprinkling, or any other mode but dipping at Baptiſm, and that they judge that Circumſtance ſuch an eſſential part of that Ordinance, that it is invalid without it, he has proved nothing to any purpoſe; for our Church preſcribes dipping as a Primitive cuſtome; but it cannot conceive it to be ſo neceſſary, but that Baptiſm may be Adminiſtred without it, and with a leſſer application of Water, as we have proved by Holy Scripture and *Greek* Authors. And as it cannot be made plain to us from the Word of God, that dipping under Water was either the Command of *Chriſt*, or the Practice of him and of his Commiſſioned *Apoſtles*, We have great reaſon to imagine, that this mode of Baptiſm may be derived to the Gentiles, and taken up by them, from the ſuperſtitious waſhings and bathings of the *Jews*, who may have entertain'd the thought, that the Baptized Perſon was not perfectly clean and fit to enter into Covenant with God, unleſs the whole Body was purified with Water. This Conjecture is not without ſome probability and proof from *Jewiſh* Authors; for their Rabbies inform us, That the Male Gentiles were Proſelyted to their Faith by Circumciſion, Baptiſm, and a Sacrifice; and the Women

men and their Female Children, by Baptiſm and a Sacrifice. They were ſo Superſtitious in their Baptiſm, that if but the tip of their Finger or Toe was not waſh'd with Water, they could not be reckon'd as Proſelytes. So ſays *Maimonides*, and other Authors confirm the ſame. What a ſtrange nicety was this to make the reality of Converſion, and conſequently of Salvation, depend upon ſuch a Punctilio? As if God regarded ſo much a total immerſion of the Body, as to exclude them from a right to his favour, for the neglect of a drop of Water in a practice of Humane Inſtitution. The *Jews* were fond of their Superſtitious Rites in the Days of Chriſt, for which he reproved them, becauſe they prefer'd the obſervation of them to the Sacred Laws of God. From this vain Opinion, that a Perſon could not be a Proſelyte without a total immerſion, and waſhed all over, is derived this Superſtitious Practice of our Anabaptiſts, firſt taken up by ſome Primitive Convert to Chriſtianity; for we know how buſie and earneſt the *Jewiſh* People were to impoſe upon the Gentiles their abrogated Rites and Cuſtoms, and we find ſome taken up by them; therefore reproved by St. *Paul*. The *Galatians* would needs be Circumciſed after the manner of the *Iſraelites*, and we find many thought themſelves oblig'd to obſerve the *Jewiſh* Sabbath. Not to mention the *Ebionites* who imitated the *Eſſeans*, the *Gnoſtics* and *Montaniſts*, who follow'd the ſteps of

other *Jewiſh* Sects, the *Cathari* and *Novatian Puritans*, who were infected with the Leaven of the *Phariſees*; the *Hemerobaptiſts*, who, like the *Jews*, waſhed themſelves every Day; there was no Error nor Extravagancy amongſt them, but we may find it embrac'd by the Heretick Gentiles and others, out of a fond eſteem of the *Jewiſh* Rites and Cuſtoms. 'Tis not unlikely that the immerſion at Baptiſm may be derived and practiſed, and fanſied as a neceſſary circumſtance by ſome Primitive Nations from the ſame Original; but we have ſo imperfect an account from the firſt two Centuries after Chriſt, of this and other matters, through the loſs of Authors, and ſcarcity of Writers of thoſe times that we can only gueſs at the truth of Chriſtians proceedings in divers caſes; and 'tis very unjuſt and unreaſonable in our Adverſaries, upon ſo ſlender, imperfect, and uncertain relations of the Primitive Practice of the Churches of Chriſt in this caſe, to condemn all the Orthodox and Reformed Churches as irregular, and deny them their Chriſtianity as our Adverſaries do, for varying from them as they ſuppoſe in ſo light a Circumſtance as this. They conſider not, that by pleading for a total Immerſion of the Body at Baptiſm, they contend to keep up amongſt us Chriſtians the *Jewiſh* inſignificant Superſtitions and Immerſions, from whence this Primitive Practice ſeems to be derived. But our Church cannot be charg'd with the countenancing of this

this Superſtition, becauſe it allows of both Modes of Sprinkling and Dipping as ſufficient and indifferent; and becauſe 'tis loth to vary from any Primitive Practice, therefore 'tis left to the Parents and Miniſters choice and prudence. However, tho' we acknowledge divers of the firſt Chriſtian Churches to have uſed Dipping or Baptiſm, if we may believe Authors, we find not any to have laid ſuch neceſſity upon the faſhion, as to forbear Sprinkling on certain occaſions, or to think it appertains to the eſſential part of that Ordinance; for we read of *Laurentius* and *Lucillus*, two Martyrs, Baptized in Priſon by Sprinkling. Neither are the Eaſtern Churches to preſcribe to us a Rule and Pattern in this Caſe: Their hot Country admitted ſuch a Practice without Prejudice to their Health; but ours being much colder, 'tis not reaſonable to impoſe upon our People ſuch a Cuſtom, which may haſten many tender Bodies to their Graves, chiefly in the frozen Seaſon of Winter, whatever Sir *John Floyer*, or other Advocates for cold Bathing may pretend, to encourage their Pernicious and Dangerous Practice, which is contradicted and oppoſed by divers, as experienced Phyſitians.

What Mr. *Stennet* ſaith as to the *Greek* Church, it was its ancient cuſtom, both to Sprinkle and Dip at Baptiſm. The firſt may be proved from the Action of the *Jew*, who hang'd his Head over the Font to be Baptized;

and 'tis obſervable that there was a Font in the Novatian Church like to ours; for it had a hole in the bottom where the Water was let out, as *Socrates* takes notice. If we may conclude from thence the conſtant practice of Baptizing the Catechumeni and Adult Perſons in the Face of the Congregation, there were none dipped there, but received their Baptiſm by an Affuſion or Sprinkling of Water. As to the *Muſcovites*, we have no certain account of their Practice in Relation to Infants, whether they be Dipped or Sprinkled, neither can ſo erroneous a Church reaſonably pretend to give Laws to the reſt of Chriſtians: But the Churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, all the Churches of *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *Sileſia*, *Moravia*, &c. all the Churches of *France*, the *Netherlands*, *Italy* and *Spain*, both Proteſtants and Papiſts, Baptize by affuſion of Water, and Judge dipping to be no material Circumſtance of this Ordinance; for the *Abyſſin* Churches under the Grand *Neguz* in *Africa*, he is miſtaken, to tell us that their Patriarch belongs to the Church of *Alexandria*. *Damianus a Goes* ſaith the contrary; for when their *Abuna* is Dead, another is elected by the *Abyſſin* Monks of *Jeruſalem*; who paſſing with the Emperor's Embaſſador thro' *Egypt*, calls upon the Patriarch of *Alexandria* at *Grand Cairo*, and only ſhews him his Commiſſion, as a Brother would do, but receives no Authority from him, neither is it probable, the one being under the *Turk*, ſhould

ſhould Command over a Patriarch of another Nation, who hath Seventeen large Kingdoms under his Juriſdiction. This is the account that *Zaga Zabo* mention'd by *Damianus a Goes* and others give. Theſe *African* Chriſtians, as Mr. *Ruſſen* very well obſerves, retain ſince the Apoſtles time the Baptiſm of Infants, and their Sprinkling in the Adminiſtration, tho' in a very hot Country. And 'tis to be obſerved, that they derived not theſe Cuſtoms from the Church of *Rome*, with which they never had any Communication but in theſe latter Days. They are Surrounded by Mahometans and Infidels, Enemies of the Chriſtian name: And that they have been very tenacious of their old Rites and Uſages in Religion to a degree of Superſtition, and therefore 'tis not probable that they have receiv'd any new Impreſſions or Preſcriptions from other Nations or Churches. And tho' they are not infallible Chriſtians, as Mr. *Stennet* tells us, their Ancient Cuſtom of Sprinkling at Baptiſm derived to them from their forefathers, is ſufficient to juſtify this mode from Mr. *Stennet*'s accuſation of Novelty, or that it was not known or practiſed in the Primitive Times.

His Fourth Argument, to prove Dipping neceſſary at Baptiſm is, *That the Uſe and Deſign of this Holy Inſtitution, being to repreſent the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and a Chriſtians dying to Sin, and riſing to newneſs of*

Life, make this a Mode of Adminiſtration appear not only proper, but neceſſary. Mr. *Stennet* confounds the Uſe that we are to make of this Ordinance, with the Deſign of Chriſt in the Inſtitution, and makes it a Typick Repreſentation of the Death of Chriſt, of his Burial, *&c.* to eſtabliſh the Neceſſity of Dipping: Whereas the Principal Intent and Deſign of it is, its being a Sign and Seal of our Entrance into Covenant with God, of the Remiſſion of our Sins, and of the acknowledgment of God for our Sovereign Lord. For which purpoſe there is no need of any ſuch Mimick Repreſentation of Chriſt's Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, *&c.* by being buried under Water. We may as well require the Baptized to remain there Three Days and Three Nights, to make the Repreſentation a more perfect Figure, or to continue under that Element till they be Dead, as Chriſt was, that they might better ſhew forth and ſhadow their Saviour breathleſs in the Grave, which would be ridiculous to imagine, and pernicious to the Lives of Men. Yet Mr. *Stennet* hath ſo great an eſteem for this Argument, that he repeats it Three or Four times in this Chapter; and tells us, *If the Ordinance of Chriſt receives its vertue from the Law of Chriſt, then it muſt be perform'd according to that Law, if we would receive a Bleſſing in it.* His reaſoning depends upon a Suppoſition, which we have proved to be falſe, That Chriſt's Law hath ordained

ed only Dipping in Baptiſm, whereas the Word ſignifies to Sprinkle, in Holy Scripture, oftner and more frequently than to dip or waſh, as I have made it appear: Neither can we gather any certain Concluſion from the Baptiſm of Chriſt, or of any of his Diſciples or Apoſtles, that they were plunged all over in Water. They went into the Water, not under it; this Expreſſion ſignifies no more but that they enter'd in perhaps Knee deep and came out again upon the dry Land. To conclude from hence Dipping, Men muſt have a ſtrange Imagination, and a ſtrong Fancy, capable of the moſt improbable and abſurd Notions. For this purpoſe he cites the counterfeit Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, the Viſion of *Hermas*, a Paſſage out of *Tertullian*, and another out of *Gregory Nazianzen*, all which ſay little more, but at Baptiſm Men enter'd into the Water. He quotes next, *Chryſoſtome* and *Ambroſe*, who prove the Mode of Dipping to be then in uſe; but both thoſe Fathers approved and practiced Sprinkling, or Affuſion of Water in divers Caſes, as may be proved from their Writings: Therefore they thought not Dipping to be ſo neceſſary in Baptiſm, as to eſteem the Sacrament null and void without it, as our Adverſaries imagine, and publickly declare in their Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith.

But Mr. *Stennet* thinks the Alluſions of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 6. *Col.* 2. *Phil.* 3. do require a Dipping under Water at Baptiſm. He muſt

muſt give me leave to correct this Miſtake, from whence he concludes the Neceſſity of Plunging under Water. In the ſixth of the *Romans*, the Apoſtle argues againſt thoſe who charg'd him with the Encouragement of Sin, that the Grace and Mercy of God might more abound in the Pardon. This Error he diſclaims, ſaying, *How ſhall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein?* He ſpeaks here of ſuch as are truly regenerate, that they were dead and ſenſleſs to Sin, took no delight in it, had an Averſion for it; and therefore could not live in the Practice and Pleaſure of Sin. He appeals next to their Knowledge, that when they were enter'd into their Holy Profeſſion by Baptiſm, *they were Baptized into the Death of Chriſt*; that is, made Partakers of his Death and Paſſion, by the Benefits then confer'd upon them by the Holy Spirit, and therefore were *buried with him by Baptiſm into Death*, that is, the Death of Sin, which they had renounced. *That like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of Life; for if we have been planted together in the Likeneſs of his Death, we ſhall be alſo in the Likeneſs of his Reſurrection*, &c. All this to the 13th *Verſe* is to be underſtood in a Spiritual Senſe, for the inward Renovation of the Mind begun and encouraged in us at Baptiſm, by the Operation of the Spirit of God; for ſuch only can be ſaid to be dead unto Sin, to be baptized into Chriſt's Death,

to

to walk in newneſs of Life, whoſe old Man is Crucified with Chriſt, that the Body of Sin might be deſtroy'd. Such only can reckon themſelves to be dead indeed unto Sin, but alive unto God through Jeſus Chriſt, that Sin might not reign in their mortal Body, that they ſhould obey it in the Luſts thereof, *&c.* 'Tis poſſible for the Wit of Man to ſtretch out a Compariſon, and to fancy an Alluſion, where there is none intended, and to deal with God's Word as ſome do with the Clouds, who imagine they ſee there the Appearances of Men, Beaſts, and creeping things, when in reality there are no ſuch viſible Shapes. Mr. *Stennet* is not the firſt who hath interpreted St. *Paul* as he does, many Learned and Orthodox Chriſtians have underſtood him acacrding to this meaning; but as the Word cannot be taken in a Literal Senſe, for the outward bare Adminiſtration of Baptiſm by Dipping, but for the inward Efficacy and Fruits of this Ordinance, for the inward Operation and Regeneration of the Mind, or for the bleſſed Conſequences and Fruits of Chriſt's Proceedings in our Redemption, I cannot underſtand how this can be applied to be buried under Water, and to iſſue out of it again, as an Image and Repreſentation of the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt. Is ſuch a Burial under Water more efficacious than Sprinkling? 'Tis likewiſe to be conſider'd that this outward Practice of Dipping under Water, cannot intitle the Baptized

Baptized to the Death, Burying, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, without an inward Application of the Spirit of God and his Bleſſing. And how many are amongſt our Adverſaries thus buried under Water, as they underſtand it with Chriſt, by being dipped at their Baptiſm, yet live in Sin, and are ſcandalous in their Lives afterwards? In like manner is to be underſtood, *Coloſ.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptiſm.* The Apoſtle expounds this Burying, which is not under Water, neither can ſuch be ſaid to be buried with Chriſt, who are plunged without him, out of his Preſence and Society, in a Literal Senſe; but St. *Paul* diſcovers the Meaning of this Burying in the former and ſucceeding Verſes, where he ſays, *In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without Hands; That is, by the Circumciſion of the Spirit of God.* Therefore 'tis made without Hands, *in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt*, and the Reformation and Sanctification of the Holy Ghoſt. *Buried with him in Baptiſm, wherein ye are alſo riſen with him*, how, and in what manner are theſe things aſſerted, the Apoſtle tells you, *Through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the Dead*, &c. That is, the ſame Omnipotency that was viſibly acting in the raiſing of Chriſt from the Dead, hath alſo quickned you, when you were dead in Sins, to a newneſs of Life through your Faith and Obedience; and not

by

by repreſenting the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, in a Mimick Obſervation of dipping under Water in Baptiſm, as Chriſt was under Ground; but by a real Death unto Sin, and a New Reformation of Life, by the Agency of the Holy Spirit in your Minds. In the other Text, *Phil.* 3. 10. there 'tis the Apoſtle deſires, *That he may know Chriſt, and the Power of his Reſurrection, and the Fellowſhip of his Sufferings, being made conformable unto his Death.* How and in what manner is this Conformity to be underſtood? Is it to be buried a Minute or Two under Water? What will this Fantaſtical Conformity avail, or benefit the Bodies or the Souls of Men? 'Tis a Spiritual Conformity to the Death of Chriſt, by being Dead unto Sin, and Living unto Righteouſneſs, that is here underſtood: The drift of the Apoſtle, and the Context point at, and plainly expreſs this Meaning of the Words. Now this is procured to the Faithful Souls, and to all ſincere Believers at our manner of Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as well as at the Dipping over Head and Ears: For by Faith in the Promiſes of God, and the Operation of the Holy Spirit in our Minds, we obtain all theſe Advantages; we are baptized into the Death of Chriſt; we are buried with him into Death; we are raiſed to walk in Newneſs of Life; our old Man is crucified with him; we are dead unto Sin, and we are alive unto God; we are in Covenant with God, and have obtained from him

the

the forgiveneſs of our Sins, *&c.* And all this is ſealed and confirmed unto us in our Baptiſm, as well by an Affuſion of a little Water, as by whole Floods and Rivers; our Perſons being all Baptized, according to Chriſt's Appointment, by the Application of Water, and the Miniſter's Words, according to God's Promiſe, *Ezek.* 36. 26. which *Rabbi Sol*, mention'd by Mr. *Lightfoot* in his *Hor. Hebr.* Page 57. expounds, *Expiabo vos, atque amovebo immunditiam veſtram per aſperſionem aquæ Purificationis:* I will make an Expiation for you, and remove away your Uncleanneſs, by the Aſperſion or Sprinkling of the Water of Purification, which under the Goſpel is to be underſtood of the Baptiſm of Water and the Spirit. And conformable to this Doctrine is St. *Paul's* Expreſſion, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *For by one Spirit we are all Baptized into one Body.* He means Chriſt's Myſtical Body, his Church, which is effected at our Baptiſm, that requires not Dipping, but an Affuſion of Water or Sprinkling. So likewiſe we are to underſtand the ſame Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. *What ſhall they do which are baptized for the Dead, if the Dead riſe not at all?* Why are they then baptized for the Dead? He alludes to the Ancient Cuſtom of ſome Churches, where ſuch as were to be baptized came to the Sepulchers of the deceaſed, and there ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν over the Bones, or Bodies, or Tombs of the deceaſed Martyrs, they received their Baptiſm,

tiſm, to encourage them to contend for the Crown of Martyrdom, in imitation of thoſe former Worthies, and to declare their Reſolution to die for Chriſt, and that they believed the Reſurrection of the Dead. Now this Cuſtom could not well be perform'd by Dipping, but by Sprinkling; for the Bodies, Bones, and Tombs of the Dead, were not floating in Water, over which theſe People were baptized. However, all other Interpretations that are given to this Text cannot conſiſt with the Mode of Dipping, but neceſſarily ſuppoſe Sprinkling, or ſuch a leſſer Ablution of Water, as I could make it appear, by examining the other ſeveral Expoſitions. Now the Words of the Learned *Cauſab.* deſerve to be recorded, on *Matth.* 2. v, 6. *Some*, ſaith he, *have contended for the whole Body to be dipped in the Ceremony of Baptiſm, for they alledge the Signification of the the Word* Βαπτίζειν: But this Opinion hath been already rejected, *Quam non in eo poſita ſit myſterii hujus vis & ἐνέργεια. For the Efficacy and Energy of this Sacrament does not conſiſt in that Action.*

The Fifth and Laſt Effort that Mr. *Stennet* makes in this Chapter, to advance and obtain Credit to the Dipping Mode at Baptiſm, He muſters up a ſmall Army of Learned Men, of all ſorts and ſizes, who vote for this Cuſtom, and declare that it was the Primitive Practice; *Grotius* leads the Van, *Keckerman*, *Daille*, *Morus*, *Philippus a Limborch*,

bach, the Aſſembly of Divines, *Joſeph Mede*, Biſhop *Taylor*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Dominicus a Soto*, Dr. *Barrow*, Biſhop *Burnet*, Dr. *Fowler*, Dr. *Cave*, Dr. *Allen*, Dr. *Towerſon*, Dr. *Whitby*, Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, Dr. *Edwards*, and a Number more. All theſe Perſons of ſeveral Opinions and Churches, were baptized in their Infancy, according to the Uſage of the Congregations unto which they belong, and by Aſperſion or Affuſion of Water: And all of them have ſince approved of, and practiced this Cuſtom, and judg'd it ſufficient to anſwer the Command of Chriſt and his Inſtitution. What ſignifies Mr. *Stennet*'s alledging their Teſtimonies, to witneſs the Primitive Practice, while by Word and Deed they declare that Dipping is a Circumſtance not belonging to the Subſtance or Eſſential Part of Baptiſm? That Sprinkling or Immerſion ſeem in reality to have the ſame Effect, and both Modes are eſteem'd ſufficient, ſee Mr. *Stennet*, Page 177. I cannot paſs over one Teſtimony more without a Correction; where 'tis ſaid, *They led them into the Water, and with no other Garments but what might cover Nature; they at firſt laid them down in the Water, as a Man is laid in his Grave, and then ſaid thoſe Words, I Baptize thee*, &c. This laying down in Water, I am perſwaded cannot be proved from any Authentick and Ancient Authors; and with reſpect to the Character of the Perſon be it ſpoken, it was never practiſed by

by any, but by our Superſtitious Anabaptiſts. And if this was written to gratify them, 'tis inexcuſable in a Perſon of that Wiſdom, Abilities, and Function, and deſerves a ſevere Cenſure. He quotes next a long diſpute between the Biſhop of *Meaux* and Mr. *De la Roque*; but to what Purpoſe I know not, unleſs it be to declare to the World his Skill in the *French* Tongue; for both the Biſhop and the Miniſter's Practice contradicts their Perſwaſion, if they judg'd Dipping to be of an abſolute neceſſity in Baptiſm: For in the *French* Churches, and in the *Roman*, 'tis very well known, that no other Mode is allowed and in uſage, but that of Sprinkling, or pouring Water on the Face: If Mr. *De la Roque* calls Aſperſion *an Abuſe*, and ſaith, *that his Church hath derived this Practice from the Church of* Rome, *without a due Examination, as many other things which it ſtill retains, renders their Baptiſm very defective.* It ſhews him to be a Man of neither Diſcretion, Prudence, Judgment or ſound Learning, to contradict in theſe Expreſſions the Practice and Perſwaſion of all the Orthodox Divines of his Communion, and to give ſuch an Advantage to the Enemies of our Chriſtian Religion, Faith, and Pious Cuſtoms. We muſt ſay as Mr. *Stennet* ſaith of others, we have no reaſon to be of his Judgment, unleſs he could prove him to be infallible.

Mr. *Stennet* concludes his Learned Chapter with a Lamentation, *That ſo many Pious and Learned*

Learned Men ſhould find themſelves ſo fetter'd by the Tyranny of Cuſtom and Tradition, &c. And we have cauſe to take up the ſame Lamentation for him and his Sect, That ſo many ſhould be poſſeſs'd with ſuch ſtrong Prejudices, and Averſion againſt the expreſs Ordinance of Chriſt, and the Primitive and General Pattern, now in uſe in the Churches of Chriſt, a Pattern, whatever ſome may pretend, founded in the Word of God, and grounded upon Reaſon, as to walk retrograde to ſo many as bear the Chriſtian Name. What ſhall we conclude from this laborious and learned Performance, and from ſo many Authors that he brings to prove the Practice of Dipping, while they all allow alſo of Sprinkling to be ſufficient; but the old Proverb is verified here, *Parturiunt Montes naſcetur ridiculus Mus.*

But I have purſued Mr. *Stennet* ſo far, that I have almoſt forgot my old Antagoniſt, my Learned School-maſter *R. M.* who tells me, that the late Archbiſhop of *York*, in a Sermon before Queen *Mary*, commends Dipping in Baptiſm as a Primitive Practice, *March* 27. 1692. I am confident *R. M.* is guilty of a blunder here, for the late Archbiſhop of *York*, Dr. *Lamplough* was dead long before; but I fancy he means the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* of bleſſed Memory. To whoſe Judgment and VVritings I dare appeal both for Infant-Baptiſm, and the ſufficiency of Sprinkling in the Ordinance of Baptiſm *R. M.* pretends to anſwer what Paſſages,

Paſſages I quote for Infant-Baptiſm from Antiquity: Firſt this Text of *Juſtin Martyr*, *That ſeveral Perſons among us, of Sixty or Seventy Years old, of both Sexes, who were diſcipled to Chriſt in their Childhood, continue uncorrupted*, *Apol.* 1. *vulgo* 2*a*. The Deſign of this and other Quotations of thoſe early days of Chriſtianity, is to diſcover to our People, and our Adverſaries that from the firſt eſtabliſhment of our Religion, the Baptiſm of Infants was in uſe, and that approved Authors mention it within the Two Hundred Years after Chriſt, in a Time that they could not be ignorant of the bleſſed Rules left to us by Chriſt and his Holy Apoſtles, for us to obſerve. But *R. M.* tells me, *That I have miſerably miſtaken the Senſe of the Author.* Wherein? Becauſe, ſaith he, *Juſtin ſpeaks there of Adultery and Fornication.* If he had diſcours'd of Theft, Slander, or any other Sin, 'twas not contrary to my Purpoſe: I alledge him, only to ſhew how Diſciples were made in the Primitive Chriſtianity, in their Childhood, and that by Baptiſm, ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριϛῷ, *from their Childhood were diſcipled to Chriſt.* That is, they were enter'd into our Saviour's School, and into Covenant with God by his Ordinance of Imitiation. Now *Juſtin Martyr* wrote his Apology to *Antoninus Pius*, the adopted Son of *Adrian*, about the Year of our Lord 150, about 50 Years after the Death of St. *John* at *Epheſus*. This Zealous Defender of

of the Chriſtian Faith, living within ſo ſhort a time after the Apoſtle, ſaith, *That ſome of 60 or 70 years of Age where Diſcipled to Chriſt, or Baptized in their Childhood*, or from that time were dedicated to him; this is a plain evidence, that within the Days of St. *John*, the Baptiſm of Infants was the undoubted practiſe of the Chriſtian Church. What *R. M.* ſays to elude this Teſtimony is inſignificant and impertinent. The next I quote is *Irenæus* his Book againſt Hereſies, where l. 2. c. 39. after he had from the Evangeliſts proved that Chriſt continu'd in his Miniſtry Three years, tells us, *Omnes enim venit per ſemet ipſum ſalvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renaſcuntur in Deum infantes, & parentes, & pueros, & juvenes, & ſeniores, &c.* For he came to ſave all Perſons by himſelf, all I mean who by him are regenerated unto God, Infants and little ones, and Children, and Youths, and Elder Perſons. Now Infants being reckoned amongſt thoſe, who by Chriſt are regenerated to God, we are to underſtand in the Author's ſenſe, that they, as well as the reſt, were Baptized by Chriſt's Command.

So *Irenæus* underſtands the word Regenerated, l. 3. c. 19. *When he gave his Diſciples the Commiſſion of Regenerating unto God*, he ſaid unto them, *Go and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. where by the Commiſſion of Regenerating, he means Chriſt's Commiſſion of Baptizing. How vainly and impertinently

pertinently does *R. M.* anſwer this Quotation. *I profeſs, Men ſaith he ſeem to be driven to hard ſhifts, to ſupport a Cauſe, when they are forced to bring ſuch places as theſe; for all that he can pretend to from hence, is, that the word Regenerate is by the Fathers uſed ſometimes to ſignify Baptiſm, therefore it is ſo to be underſtood here.* Shall we underſtand the Author according to his own expoſition, or as *R. M.* would have us, for the inward work of Regeneration? *Irenæus* in the forementioned place, and in divers others, as well as the other Fathers, take Regeneration for Baptiſm, and ſo 'tis interpreted in the Annotation, *by the Name of Regeneration, which is our Lords, and an Apoſtolick Phraſe*, Irenæus *underſtands Baptiſm, by which he plainly confirms the Apoſtolick Tradition of the Baptiſm of little Infants againſt the Impiety of the Anabaptiſts.* when *Irenæus* mentions Infants to be regenerated, 'tis intelligible enough, that they are not capable of Regeneration, as far as we underſtand in any other ſenſe of the word, than as it ſignifies Baptiſm, that is the outward adminiſtration of Baptiſm, by which they are enter'd into Covenant with God, and into his Churches Communion. But this unadviſed Anſwerer ſaith, That *Ireneus* knew nothing of making Infants Diſciples by Baptiſm without Teaching, becauſe he ſaith, *How had Chriſt Diſciples, if he did not teach?* I have already given a reply to *R. M.* that the Author there ſpeaks

not

not of Infants, but argues againſt thoſe, who ſaid, *Illi dicunt uno Anno Chriſtum prædicaſſe, & duodecimo menſe paſſum, &c.* They ſay that Chriſt fulfill'd his Miniſtry in one year, and the Twelfth Month was put to Death, *&c.* Such ſaith he, paſs over the chief part of his buſineſs, and the moſt neceſſary and moſt honourable part of his Age, that part in which by teaching he commanded all Perſons. *For how had he Diſciples if he did not Teach, and how did he teach, if he had not attained to the Age of a Maſter; for he came not to Baptiſm till he was Thirty years of Age?* He ſpeaks of Chriſt's inſtructing his Diſciples and the Multitude, and it is evident, he could have none of them to be his Diſciples without teaching. What is this to Infants? *R. M.* is like thoſe miſhapen Beaſts, that when they came to drink out of a clear Water, and ſee their ugly Phyſiognomy and Shape trouble the Water by ſtirring up the Mud that they might no longer behold what they are vexed to ſee. Thus my Antagoniſt confounds and diſturbs the cleareſt Quotations for Infant Baptiſm out of Antiquity, with Ironical expreſſions, and falſe and improper applications which belong not to them, that he might not diſcover there his impiety and pernicious Error. For *Origen* and *Cyprian* he fancies he hath me at an advantage, becauſe there is a miſtake in the Chronoligy: muſt here rectify the Printers Error, and that of my Antagoniſt in both. *Origene* when hi

his Father *Leonides* ſuffer'd Martyrdom, by being Beheaded at *Alexandria*, which was in the Tenth year of *Severus*, about *A. D.* 202. was then Seventeen years old, as *Euſebius* tells us, ſo that he was born about the year 185, Eighty four years after the Death of St. *John* at *Epheſus*, who lived till the Reign of *Trajan*, about *A. D.* 101 There may be two years difference in the reckoning. This *Origen* was a Learned Man, eſteem'd by all ſorts of People, and a zealous Chriſtian, publickly known, and his Writings read all over the Eaſtern parts; ſo that his Teſtimony concerning Infant Baptiſm, is not of a ſingle Perſon, as Biſhop *Taylor* ſaith, but of all the Age wherein he lived; for what he affirms was never contradicted by any of that Time, but approved of, and applauded as an undoubted truth: And 'tis to be conſider'd, that he living within Eighty Two, or Eighty Four years after the Death of the Apoſtle St. *John*, and being Born of Chriſtian Parents, and Baptized in his Infancy within 200 years of the Birth of Chriſt, could not be ignorant of the practice of the Apoſtles, and of the cuſtoms of Chriſtians in a matter of that concern as Baptiſm, the Seal of the Goſpel Covenant. Now let us hear, and I deſire *R. M.* to underſtand, how expreſly he ſpeaks for Infant Baptiſm, as the conſtant uſage of Chriſtians in his and the former Ages. In his Eighth *Hom.* on *Lev.* 12. after he had acknowledged with *David*, the original Sin and Guilt, with which all Mankind is naturally Polluted, he ſaith, *What is the reaſon, that whereas the*

Baptiſm of the Church is given 'em for forgiveneſs of Sins, Infants alſo are by the uſage of the Church Baptized? When if there were nothing in Infants that wanted forgiveneſs and Mercy, the Grace of Baptiſm would be needleſs to them. And in a Homil. on *Luke* 14, he ſaith, *Having occaſion given by this place, I will mention a thing that cauſes frequent enquiries among the Brethren, Infants are Baptized for the forgiveneſs of Sins: Of what Sins? Or when have they Sinned? Or how can any reaſon of the waſhing of Infants in their Caſe hold good, but according to that ſenſe that we mention'd before. None is free from Pollution, tho' his Life continue but one day upon Earth; and 'tis for that reaſon, becauſe by the Sacrament of Baptiſm the Pollution of our Birth is taken away, that Infants are Baptized.* Likewiſe on the 6th Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *l.* 5. He declares, *becauſe of Original Sin, That the Church had from the Apoſtles a Tradition to give Baptiſm even to Infants. For they to whom the Divine Myſteries were committed knew that there is in all Perſons the natural Pollution of Sin, which muſt be done away by Water and the Spirit.* The Works of *Origen* were Tranſlated by St. *Jerom* and *Rufinus*, Men of Orthodox Principles, and therefore very well atteſted: And 'tis not probable that both would agree to deliver to the World a falſe Interpretation in this caſe. *He was of a Family that had profeſſed the Chriſtian Faith many years. Euſebius* tells us, His Forefathers had been Chriſtians for ſeveral Generations.

Generations. And *Ruſinus* ſaith, *That the Chriſtian Doctrine had been conveyed to him*, ab avis atque atavis, *from his Grandfather and great Grandfather.* Beſides he had Travell'd into *Syria*, *Cappadocia*, *Arabia*, *Greece*, and had viſited *Rome*, and could not be Ignorant of the Chriſtians Rites and Cuſtoms in this caſe, he having been baptized in his Infancy, about the year 185, and his Father, and probably his Grandfather before him Baptiz'd in their Childhood; ſo that he cou'd witneſs Infant Baptiſm to be the practice of the Church from the days of St. *John* in his own Family. Now is it probable that a Man of that Repute, a Publick Perſon of that Eſteem and Learning, would advance and propagate an untruth to Poſterity, to the undoing and ruin of his own Reputation, when all the World in thoſe days could contradict him, and in a caſe ſo publickly known, and without any advantage to himſelf? We may therefore; from the premiſes, trace the Baptiſm of Infants, in, and from the Days of the Apoſtles, in thoſe Times, as *Irenæus* affirms: Where all Churches did agree in the fundamental Doctines of Religion. With what impudence dare *Curcellæus*, our old Adverſaries, and particularly the Anſwerer of the Queſtions of the Athenian Society, *Anno.* 1691 about Pædobaptiſm, and *R. M.* affirm, *That for* 200 *years after Chriſt, the Baptiſm of Infants was unknown to the Church, and that it began to be practiſed in the Third*

Century. Such Lyes our Antagoniſts whiſper and ſpread amongſt their Ignorant Proſelytes, to fix them in their averſion to this holy inſtitution of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, appointed for the benefit of Infants, as well as of the Adult.

My uncivil and rude Antagoniſt refuſes the Teſtimony of *Platina*, who in a matter of Fact may be credited, and the conſtant practice of the *Roman* Church in Baptizing Infants is no deſpicable evidence of its Primitive and Apoſtolick Tradition, derived from the Inſtitution of Chriſt; but my Anſwerer is miſtaken, when he ſays no writings of thoſe Times affirm it; for beſides thoſe I have already mention'd, *Dionyſius* the Areopagite, *cap. ult. Clemens l. 6. c.* 15. and others, make mention of it. The Church of *Rome* continued pure and undefiled many Centuries after Chriſt, and was applauded, and approved of by all the Churches of the World for an Orthodox Church: Therefore in relation to this Rite and Uſage, its Authority and conſtant Practice cannot be rejected, but by our unreaſonable Anabaptiſts.

Mr. *Baxter* obſerves, that this Order of *Hyginus*, Biſhop of *Rome*, of not receiving Children to Baptiſm without a Godfather and Godmother, related by *Platina*, is witneſſed by the currant conſent of Hiſtorians. In this order no queſtion is made of the Baptiſm of Infants, but thereby ſuppoſed to be the uſage of Chriſt's Church. Nor doth a-

ny

ny other Hiſtory ſpeak of the beginning of it ſince the Apoſtles. Now *Hyginus* lived about the year of our Lord 144, and as *Onuphrius* ſaith 138, in the days of *Antoninus Pius*, near the time of *Polycarpus*, who had converſed with thoſe, who had ſeen the Lord, and was by the Apoſtles made Biſhop of *Smyrna*, unto whom Chriſt addreſſed an Epiſtle in the Revelations. So that *Hyginus* living about 40 years after St. *John*, and having been familiar with the Apoſtles Diſciples, he could not be ignorant of their Practice in the Baptizing of Infants, nor could he impoſe upon the Chriſtian World in a matter of Fact, ſo publickly known, of which ſo many Thouſands were partakers. There were many Hundreds then alive that could tell what the Apoſtles did, and whether they or their Parents were Baptized in infancy or not. Can any of us be ignorant what was practiſed 40 or 50 years ago? Therefore this Teſtimony of *Platina* is a plain evidence that the Baptiſm of Infants was in uſe in the days of the Holy Apoſtles, and was never queſtion'd, as being the conſtant Practice of Chriſtians in that Time. For the Teſtimony of *Cyprian* 'tis ſo expreſs for the Baptiſm of Infants, that *Tombs* would have him to be one of the firſt promoters of it, in his Exam. p. 10, 11. Let his Age and time be *A. D.* 250 or 143. He was, when he was choſen Biſhop of *Carthage*, 40 or 50 years old; for few were admitted to that Function before

that Age. He muſt therefore very well underſtand the practiſe of the Churches of God of thoſe days, and before the year 200, concerning the Baptiſm of Infants. And if ſuch a Cuſtom had begun at that time, ſome mention had been made by him or by others of ſuch an Innovation, and charg'd upon ſome Perſons or Councils; but *Cyprian* mentions it, as the uſage of the Churches of God, *That Baptiſm was not to be denied to Infants*, &c. And ſends a long Epiſtle to *Fidus* a Country Biſhop, and affirming withal, *That 'twas the Judgment of above* 60 *Biſhops beſides himſelf then met together.* This is ſo far from being a forged piece, as *Danvers* boldly ſuppoſes, that St. *Hierom* repeats it, Epiſtle 28. And St. *Auſtin* and many others own it, as the judgment of that Holy Martyr. But to this evidence ſo plain for Infant Baptiſm, my Antagoniſt is as Mute as a Fiſh.

He brings a Paſſage out of *Tertullian*, and ſaith, that he is the firſt that ſpeaks of Baptiſm of Infants, which is falſe; and tho' he ſpeaks againſt it, and would have their Baptiſm delayed till years of diſcretion, yet by what he ſaith, we may judge that it was in uſe in thoſe early Days. And we have leſs cauſe to wonder that he was no Friend to Infant Baptiſm, becauſe he fell in his latter days into grievous Errors; yet in this Treatiſe *de Baptiſmo*, he ſeems to contradict, what he ſays in another place; for theſe are his words,

words, c. 12. *Quum vero præſcribitur nemini ſine Baptiſmo competere Salutem, &c.* Whereas 'tis declared that Salvation is not to be obtain'd without Baptiſm, *&c.* And in his Treatiſe *de Anima*, the Apoſtles meaning is to be underſtood thus, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *That the Children of the faithful are deſign'd for Holineſs, and ſo for Salvation; that by a Pledge of ſuch hope, he might plead for thoſe Marriages which he would have to be continu'd, otherwiſe he knew what our Lord had determined; Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of God*; that is, *he ſhall not be Holy. Thus every Soul is reckon'd as in* Adam, *ſo long till he be anew enrolled in Chriſt, and ſo long unclean till he be ſo enrolled, and ſinful becauſe unclean*, &c. Is this Man here againſt Infant Baptiſm? Does not he Plead for the neceſſity of it from the words of Chriſt, and the unclean State of *Adam*'s Poſterity? Does not he declare them to be defiled and in a ſinful condition till they be enrolled, that is Baptized? He lived about 100 years after St. *John*, and ſpeaks of the Baptiſm of Infants, not as any Innovation in the Church, but as an old and practiſed Rite and Cuſtom. If he was not of an Orthodox opinion in one place, he ſeems to be otherwiſe in another; for the enrolling and baptizing Infants in caſe of neceſſity, and to remedy their uneleanneſs. And whereas my Schoolmaſter ſaith, *The pure and Apoſtolick Age knew nothing of Infant Baptiſm*: This is falſe, as I have proved in the Teſtimo-

ny, that *Origen* and others give. What he alledges out of *Juſtin Martyr*, relates to Adult Perſons, converted to the Chriſtian Faith, and concerns not Infants; and therefore the Martyr had no reaſon to make any Digreſſion, to ſpeak of Infants and their Reception into the Church, nor *R. M.* to ſay, That he would have mention'd it here, had it been the Practice of the Church.

My Anſwerer ſtuffs his Pamphlet with a Parcel of falſe Tales, to deceive the Vulgar, in the former Pages and here, by ſaying, *That Infants Baptiſm ſeems not to have been generally received, till the Third Century was well advanced.* Whereas from the premiſed Quotations of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, &c. we can trace, and prove it to be an undoubted Right and Practice of the Church, from the Days of Chriſt and his Holy and Inſpir'd Apoſtles.

The Practice and Judgment of all the Reformed Churches he deſpiſes, and ſays, *I might have ſpared the Labour of bringing ſo many of the Proteſtant Churches againſt them:* For the Anabaptiſts will not believe in this Caſe, a Word what they ſay. He names them Brethren; but with what Reaſon, I ſhall hereafter examine his Diſſimulation in this Title; but whether they own the Anabaptiſts, as Brethren, I queſtion, ſince they abhorr their Sect and Hereſy as impious, and pernicious to the Church of God, and contrary to the Articles of our Faith. But I would

would ask *R. M.* Whether they are his Brethren, whom he ranks amongſt the Heathens, Turks and Papiſts? And values them no more than thoſe Infidels and Hereticks, Enemies of the true Chriſtian and Orthodox Faith? I could name a Number of their moſt Pious and Judicious Learned Doctors, who diſown all Brotherhood with, or Relation to ſuch an Antichriſtian Sect, as the Anabaptiſts. But the Reaſon that he gives for his Contempt of their Authority and Practice in this Caſe, is as weak as the reſt of his reaſoning. *If the Multitude of Oppoſers be any ſign of a good Cauſe, I perſwade my ſelf, that the Heathens, Turks, or Papiſts, may plead for their Superſtitions with too much advantage over us both.* What an unequal Compariſon is this of the Churches of Chriſt, led by the Spirit of God, enjoying the Light of the Goſpel, with all the Aſſiſtance of Humane and Divine Learning and Revelation, with Heathens, Turks and Papiſts, nurſed and tutoured up in Ignorance, Unbelief, with Prejudices, and with all the Diſadvantages, contrary to the Privileges of the former? Do our Adverſaries think that none underſtand the Will of God in this Caſe, beſides themſelves? Are they ſo conceited, to imagine that true Divine Knowledge and Salvation is attainable only in their Sect? And that all the Churches of Chriſt are in Error or Damned, beſides themſelves? Have not we the ſame Helps to Divine Knowledge and

Truth that they have? Is it probable that their Blue, Green, and Leathern Apron Teachers, are better adviſed in the Matters of Faith and Practices of Religion, than the moſt Learned and Pious Governors and Doctors of the Chriſtian Church? If the Heathens, Turks, and Papiſts, had the ſame Advantages in Religion as Chriſtians have, they would doubtleſs embrace our Faith, and forſake their Superſtitions. Therefore conſidering the Circumſtances of both, and their want of the Means of Divine Knowledge which we enjoy, *R. M*'s. Argument is impertinent and unreaſonable; but anſwerable to his weak Capacity and his former Notions.

He adds next, *That perhaps he could ſhew, that moſt of thoſe Proteſtant Churches which he quotes againſt us, are againſt the Dioceſan Biſhops of his Church. And yet he believes he does not think this is a convincing Argument againſt them.* *R. M.* like a Blind Leader of the Blind, gropes in the dark, and is as ignorant of the Judgment of thoſe Churches, in relation to Epiſcopacy, as he is of the Truths of the Goſpel, and of the Matter in Controverſy. All thoſe Proteſtant Churches that I quote, reverence and highly eſteem the Epiſcopal Order and Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, none excepted. The Churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, tho' *Lutherans*, have their Biſhops; The Churches of the *Muſcovites*, have their Patriarch, and an Epiſcopal Subor-

Subordination; The Churches of *Greece* 'tis known, tho' they live under the *Turk*, have yet their Patriarchs, Archbiſhops and Biſhops; The *Calviniſts* Churches in the *Low-Countries*, *Germany*, *Switzerland*, and *France*, are ſo far from being againſt our Epiſcopal Order, that they highly approve of it, admire our Conſtitution, and willingly ſubmit to it, when their Members come amongſt us. I will appeal to the Writings and Letters of Monſ. *Oſterwald*, late or preſent Miniſter of *Newchatel*, to the Letters of *Geneva*, from their Univerſity, lately directed to my Right Reverend Dioceſan the Biſhop of *London*, and to the Univerſity of *Oxford*, mention'd in a late Mercury. And to ſhew that the *Calviniſts* have been always Friends to our Order and Epiſcopacy, whatever our Diſſenters have whiſper'd amongſt our People to the contrary, let any Man conſult a Letter of *Peter Martyr*'s, written at his Return from the Meeting of *Poiſy*, mention'd at the End of his Common-Places, directed to Mr. *Calvin*, or ſome other Friend; where he ſhall find the Biſhop of *Troja* or *Troy* in *Champagne*, at his Arrival at his Inn, paying him a Viſit, and declaring, That he was for the Reformation of his Dioceſs; and, That he had ſent to all the Reformed Miniſters, to know how they would receive him as their Biſhop, or as their Brother; and, That they had all agreed to admit him as their Dioceſan Biſhop. I would have my unadviſed Antagoniſt know, that

that all Foreign Churches have a great Veneration for our Epiſcopal Order; none but our *Britiſh* Diſſenters, poſſeſſed with a Fanatic Spirit of Contradiction, contemn and reject this Primitive and Apoſtolick Conſtitution, eſtabliſh'd in the Church by the Direction of the Holy Ghoſt. If they have not the ſame Order amongſt them, their Reformation would not bear it at the Beginning, and therefore they could not ſince conveniently alter their firſt Eſtabliſhment.

My abuſive Adverſary intimates next, That I have falſified the Records, and mangled the Quotations more than *Danvers* and *Tombs*, whom Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Wills* have detected and charg'd long ſince with that Crime, and proved it to their Faces by ſeveral Inſtances; but *R. M.* cannot bring one Record falſified, or Quotation mangled, unleſs he charges me with the Two Miſtakes of the Preſs in the Firſt Edition: Therefore *R. M.* declares himſelf in Print to be a publick Slanderer. Again he ſaith, *that I oddly inſinuate, that they don't baptize in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, &c. His Miſtakes are ſo many, that I can ſcarce take notice of them all. I know not what he and thoſe of his Party do in this Caſe; but divers who bear the Name of Anabaptiſts, omit the Rule that Chriſt preſcribes at the Dipping of their Proſelytes. The *Hutites* and *Socinian* Anabaptiſts, and many others,

as

as the *Eutychians* of old are guilty of this Error. I had therefore Reaſon to queſtion in what Terms ſome of them dip their People; but inſinuate no ſuch matter in relation to him or his particular Congregation.

But in the next Paragraph, the Devil of Anabaptiſm appears bare-Faced, without any Diſguiſe, by telling us, *That the Baptiſm which Infants receive, is not Baptiſm, but a Nullity*, &c. Let all Men judge from the Premiſes, whether the Baptiſm of our Infants be not according to the Preſcription and Rule of our Bleſſed Saviour, both in Subject and Mode. Therefore when he calls it an Error, he proves himſelf again to be a wicked Slanderer of our Church and Practice, as well as of my Perſon, and an abuſive Tongue and Pen. But *R. M.* ſpeaks in the Language of all Anabaptiſts, and Catabaptiſts: For in their Confeſſion of Faith 'tis declared, *That Immerſion or Dipping of the Perſon in Water, is neceſſary to the due Adminiſtration of this Ordinance.* And in their Catechiſm to this Queſtion, How is Baptiſm rightly adminiſtred? Is anſwer'd, *Baptiſm is rightly adminiſtred by Immerſion, or Dipping the Whole Body of the Party in Water, into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, and the Practice of the Apoſtles; and not by Sprinkling, or Pouring of Water, or Dipping ſome Part of the Body, after the Tradition of Men. See here, how they breed up their young Fry, with

with an Averſion to, and Prejudices againſt our Church and Order; See how they declare our Baptiſm of Infants by Affuſion to be erroneous, both in Subject and Mode; See how they proclaim all Churches that uſe Sprinkling, to Practiſe the Traditions of Men, and not that of Chriſt; and therefore *R. M.* from theſe Doctrines, concludes our Baptiſm to be null and void. Shall I explain his Meaning; That conſequently we and all other Churches, that uſe any other Mode, but theirs of Dipping over Head and Ears, are no Chriſtians; That our Churches are no Churches of Chriſt; That our Miniſters are not lawfully Commiſſioned; That we are Heathens, and in the State of Infidels, without God and Chriſt; out of the Covenant of Grace, and can claim no Title to Heaven, Happineſs, or to the Promiſes of the Goſpel, or to the Redemption of our Bleſſed *Meſſiah*; That our Biſhops, and the whole Order of the Clergy are Pretenders to and Uſurpers of a Function, that they have no Right to exerciſe; and, That 'tis unlawful to go and hear them, or to join in Communion with them. This is the pernicious Conſequence of this deviliſh Hypotheſis, by which they overthrow all Chriſtianity amongſt us and other Proteſtants, and diſable the Sacred Function from performing the Duties of their Callings. This was the Opinion of one *Cox*, mention'd by Mr. *Baxter*, who went to *Coventry* as a Meſſenger, to confirm

confirm the Anabaptiſts there: He ſaid, *'Twas not lawful to join with our People never ſo Godly, becauſe they were not baptized by Dipping.* *Tombs* and ſeveral others were of the ſame Perſwaſion; and ſo is my Antagoniſt, as appears by what he ſays. And what Influence this helliſh Doctrine may have upon their deluded People, in relation to the Civil Magiſtrate, and the Soveraign Authority amongſt us, let every one judge: For the Anabaptiſts reckon them alſo amongſt the Infidels, and no Chriſtians; and their Baptiſm to be null and void. How far this Error may grow and proceed to bolder Attempts againſt the Government of the Nation, may be eaſily conjectur'd, if they ſhould be encouraged by Power and their increaſing Numbers, as they were at *Munſter.* At their firſt Appearance in that City, they were Humble, Meek, and entertain'd a Familiarity with the Evangelicks; but when they were in a Condition to preſcribe Laws, they baniſh'd them as well as the reſt: Therefore this wicked Sect is dangerous to both Church and State, and tends to undermine, and in time to overthrow both. He pretends St. *Cyprian* was of his Mind, to Re-baptize, when the former Baptiſm was pretended to be null: But *Cyprian* and all other Biſhops of thoſe Days, never were of Opinion, That ſuch as were Baptized in Infancy, or by Sprinkling, were not legally Baptized, or that there was any Nullity in that Mode and

Subject

Subject of Baptiſm. But he abuſes *Cyprian* and the Biſhops of thoſe Days, by miſrepreſenting their Opinion; for they thought all who return'd to the Church from any Hereſy, ſhould be Re-baptized; or ſuch as fell from the Faith, ſhould be received again into the Church by this Laver of Regeneration, and not becauſe their firſt Baptiſm was *Null.* But *Steven*, then *Biſhop* of *Rome*, reprehended *Cyprian* for this Innovation; and *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, was of a more Orthodox Judgment, and many others condemn'd this Practice as a noted Hereſy, and a monſtrous Opinion, and an Act contrary to the Chriſtian Faith and Uſage, as may be ſeen in *Euſeb. Lib.* 8. *Cap.* 2, 3, 4.

R. M. ſeems to be very much offended at my repreſenting out of what Trades and Occupations the *Anabaptiſts* commonly elect their Teachers. I have reaſon to complain of the Intruſion into my little Pariſh, of *Tallow-Chandlers*, *Pedlars*, *Tinkers*, *Taylors*, *Tinmen*, &c. who come to delude my People, and hold forth at a Meeting-Houſe within my Precincts. I have no leſs cauſe to complain of their Ignorance, and erroneous Principles, which they inſtill into the Minds of the unadviſed Hearers. But he retorts upon me this Reflection, and ſaith, *That thoſe who read my Book would think I talk more like a Catechumen, than a Catechiſt.* *R. M.* muſt ſay ſomething, tho' it be never ſo uncivil, abuſive and abſurd. At the Beginning of his

his Libel, he ſeem'd to deny me the Title of a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Chriſtian; and now he wont allow me to be a Teacher, but a Catechumen. His Judgment is not much to be valued, after the Approbation that I have received from the Learned World, from Three Famous *Univerſities*, whereof I have been a Member, and admitted to an honourable Degree in one of ours at home. And as 'tis the ordinary Practice of the Men of his Sect, to abuſe and diſcredit the moſt Pious and Learned Order of Men of our Church, I have leſs cauſe to wonder at his contemptuous Expreſſions of my Perſon and Abilities.

But he ſaith next, *That I ſlaunder the Anabaptiſts as if they had no order or Rule among them.* I know not what Order or Rule they have; but 'tis not ſuch as Chriſt and his Apoſtles have left us to imitate, and preſcribed to us. The Devils and Evil Spirits of the Infernal Empire, have their Order and Rule; for they have their *Principalities and Powers, and the Rulers of the Darkneſs of this World*, Epheſ. 6. 12. He boaſts that they have amongſt them Men of good Learning. It may be ſo; but ſuch were the ancient and Modern *Heretieks*, who employ'd their Wit and Learning to devour, like Wolves, the Flock of Chriſt, *Acts* 20. and to draw Diſciples after them. But I hope he will not reckon himſelf amongſt theſe Men of good Learning, who argues ſo ſimply, and ſeems to be

be ignorant of his own Catechiſm, as I have already obſerved. He informs us next, *That their Churches take care to let none Preach but thoſe, who underſtand the Word of God and the Grounds of Religion well*; which I cannot find that *R. M.* ever did. To qualify a Man for an *Anabaptiſt* Teacher, as far as I can underſtand, if he can Whine handſomly, Bawl ſtrenuouſly, and Cant properly, devoutly, and demurely, as an Hypocrite; if he can ſlander the Church of *England*, exclaim againſt our Function, Diſcipline, and Devotions; if he can cry out againſt Sprinkling in Baptiſm, and quote the uſual and miſtaken Texts againſt the Admiſſion of Infants to that Ordinance; if he has but a voluble Tongue, and Confidence enough (I ſhould ſay Impudence) to ſpeak in Publick, tho' the Man's Learning never reach'd ſo far as the *Latin Grammar*, he ſhall be advanced from his Shop-board, or his Anvil, to a Pulpit, tho' he be never ſo ignorant in the Myſteries of Chriſtianity. In Conſcience, are ſuch Men fit and proper Embaſſadors of our Lord Jeſus, and Stewards of the Myſteries of Godlineſs, who underſtand not what they are? What Nonſenſe, Errors, and Blaſphemy have often proceeded from the Mouths of ſuch bold Uſurpers of, and Intruders into the Sacred Function, Mr. *Pagitt* has given us a mournful Account in his *Hereſiography*, as well as divers other Authors upon their certain Knowledge, as *Pontanus*, *Oſiander*,

Sleidan

Sleidan, &c. See *Pagitt. p.* 14. But I cannot but take notice, what he affirms, and Mr. *Stennet* juſtifies, that their Churches are the Electors of their Teachers; that is, every particular Congregation, or the People of ſuch a Meeting. And ſo I find it in their Confeſſion of Faith, *That Biſhops, or Elders, and Deacons, are to be choſen by the common Suffrage of the Church it ſelf*; that is, the common People of every ſuch particular Congregation. In this the *Anabaptiſts* copy after the *Congregational* or *Independent* Model, and fulfil St. *Paul*'s Prophecy to *Timothy*: *The time will come, when they will not endure ſound Doctrine*; *but after their own Luſts ſhall they heap to themſelves Teachers, having itching Ears*, 2 Tim. 4. 3. Here is a plain Diſcovery of this Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*, that heaps to it ſelf Teachers from the Scum and Dregs of the Country, the People being Electors. But as St. *Paul* ſpeaks in another Caſe, we may ſay, *That we have no ſuch Cuſtom, nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. 'Tis no wonder if they vote for, and promote ſuch for their Teachers, who are their fellow Tradeſmen, *Coblers*, *Tinkers*, *Porters*, *Coopers*, *Butchers*, and ſuch like, who are gifted with nothing but Impudence, Ignorance, and a freedom of Speech. This is not according to the Primitive Pattern of Electing Officers in the Church; Chriſt glorified not himſelf, but received his Commiſſion from the Father, and conveys his Autho-

Authority to his Apoſtles, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, John 20. 21. Likewiſe the Apoſtles ordained and left their Commiſſion to the ſucceeding Biſhops, who may be named Elders, becauſe of their Age and Gravity. But there was always one Superior, or Biſhop, in every City, who had the Inſpection, Government of, and Super-intendency over the reſt, as we may underſtand by the Epiſtles to *Timothy*, and to *Titus*, and by the concurring Teſtimony of all ſucceeding Ages, till theſe unhappy Days, in which our *Sectaries* have caſt off all Reverence and Obedience due by Chriſt's Appointment to the Epiſcopal Order and Function, and have ſet up amongſt themſelves New Forms and New Modes, as well as New Doctrines, in oppoſition to the Order recommended to us from the Primitive Churches, and the Holy Apoſtles. 'Tis certain the Seven Deacons, tho' recommended by the Diſciples, were ordained by the Twelve Apoſtles, *Acts* 6. who appointed Biſhops and Elders in every City, *Titus* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 3. And *Euſebius* tells us, *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 20. That after St. *John* was return'd from his Baniſhment to *Epheſus*, he went into the Country adjoining, being requeſted *partly to Conſecrate Biſhops, partly to ſet in order whole Churches, and partly to chuſe by Lot unto the Eccleſiaſtical Function of them, whom the Holy Ghoſt had aſſigned.* And in his *Lib.* 6. *Cap.* 42. he brings in *Cornelius*, Biſhop

Biſhop of *Rome*, ſaying, *That there ought to be but one Biſhop in the Catholick Church:* He means in every City. To theſe Biſhops it belong'd to ordain Miniſters, witneſs the ſame Author, *Lib.* 6. *Cap.* 22. ſpeaking of *Origen*, *That he was made Miniſter at* Cæſarea, *of the Biſhops there abiding.* In all the Records of the Primitive Churches it appears, that the power of Election and Ordination of Presbyters and Deacons, was lodg'd chiefly in the Biſhops of the ſeveral Dioceſes, tho' the People gave their Teſtimonials and Approbation.

Mr. *Stennet*, in anſwer to Mr. *Broome*, juſtifies the People's Election, and the pretended Ordination of all the *Anabaptiſt* Church-Officers, without exception, as warrantable, from *Acts* 6. This we deny, that this Text, or any other of Holy Scripture, unto which we appeal in this Caſe, implies any ſuch Right in the People. The Superior Officers, as *Apoſtles*, were choſen and call'd by Chriſt, who derived his Miſſion from God the Father. And they would not preſume to nominate one inſtead of the Traytor *Judas*, without God's Approbation by a Lot, which fell on *Matthias*. The ſucceeding Biſhops, Presbyters, or Elders, were elected and ordained by them, and by virtue of their Commiſſion from their Maſter. *For this cauſe*, ſaith the Apoſtle to *Titus*, 1. 5. *left I thee in* Crete, *that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the Things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had*

had appointed thee. God never granted to the Mob a Rite of chuſing to the Sacred Function ſuch Officers, whoſe Authority immediately depends upon him: 'Tis a preſumptuous Uſurpation of the Divine Power to pretend to any ſuch Right, which being originally derived from God, was by him entruſted in the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors the Biſhops of the Chriſtian Church. Neither are the vulgar People capable of ſuch a Choice, to underſtand who are fit Perſons to undertake the Function of a Miniſter of Chriſt: They may judge of their Morals, but they are no competent Judges of their Learning and Abilities. Beſides, if this were allowed, it would follow, That the Authority of Adminiſtring the Sacraments, and the other Powers committed by Chriſt to his Church-Officers, were now lodg'd in the Body of the People; for none can give to another, what he hath not. And none hath Power to elect, or ordain to a Function in Chriſt's Church, which was never granted from above. 'Tis true, the Election of the Seven *Deacons* was made by the Diſciples; but they were firſt empower'd by the Apoſtles, *v.* 3. *Look ye out among you Seven Men of honeſt Report*, &c. but they add, *whom we may appoint over this Buſineſs*. The People had from the Apoſtles, liberty to recommend; but the Ordination and Appointment was reſerved for them. Again, we may obſerve, that theſe were inferior Officers, choſen to act in Subordination

nation to the Apoſtles, and never had any immediate Commiſſion from God, as they had, and were entruſted with the Poors Stock, with ſerving of Tables, *&c.* Mr. *Stennet* queſtions, whether 'tis not as reaſonable, that the People ſhould chuſe the Perſons, under whoſe care they entruſt their Souls, as their Purſes? I anſwer the caſe is different; They are no proper Electors of God's Officers and Stewards in his Houſe, as they are of fit managers of Money; neither is it the People who entruſt theſe Officers, but God, witneſs *Paul*'s words, *Acts* 20 28. to the Elders of *Epheſus*, *Take heed unto your ſelves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own Blood; obſerve, the Holy Ghoſt, not the People, hath made you overſeers.* Therefore there is this difference between us, and the Anabaptiſt Teachers: We are God's Miniſters, they are the Peoples. We are entruſted by God, with the care of Souls; they are entruſted by the deluded Vulgar. We have receiv'd our Commiſſion and Authority from Chriſt and his Biſhops; they have no Authority but from the ſuffrages of an Heretical and Schiſmatical Mob. Judge ye therefore what kind of Miniſters of Chriſt theſe Men are to be eſteem'd, who, as our Adverſaries confeſs, have their Powers only from the Votes of the People, who chuſe and *heap to themſelves Teachers, having itching ears,*

for

for they will not endure ſound Doctrine, 2. Tim. 4, 3. *But give heed unto ſeducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils*, 1 Tim. 4. Have theſe bold *Uſurpers of Chriſt*'s Authority in his Church, any liberty from him of adminiſtring Sacraments, or of acting as God's Miniſters? No more than the *Turkiſh* Caliphs and Mufties. What truſt or dependance can their miſerable People have upon ſuch Blind Leaders of the Blind? As they proceed without any Legal Warrant from God, their Execution of the Miniſterial Function is unwarrantable and vain, and 'tis no Blaſphemy to name them as really they are, *Wolves in Sheeps cloathing*, *Agents and Factors of the Devil*, the grand deceiver, whoſe intereſt they promote in divers caſes, but particularly in the engagement and promiſe, they impoſe upon them whom they dip: They require from them a Vow, never to forſake their Sect, never to hear or adhere to any other Perſwaſion or Denominations of Chriſtians; to abandon the Church and Clergy of *England*; to keep to that Congregation, in which they have been dipped, to keep a Trade within themſelves, and to employ no handicrafts Men but of their own Profeſſion, as I am inform'd, *&c.* So that as Chriſt's deſign and intereſt in his Church, is Unity and Union; theſe Men by this means are divided from the Body of Chriſtianity, and Cantoned amongſt themſelves; for every Congregation hath its particular Biſhop, Elder,

Elder, or Paſtor as they name them, elected and choſen by the ſuffrages of Men, Women, and Adult Children. Judge ye of the worthy choice from ſuch ſcandalous Principals, and how contrary this Sect is to the deſign of Chriſt in our Redemption, which is, that we might all be One; for the end and drift of Anabaptiſm is Diviſion. Let not Mr. *Stennet* and Mr. *Hooke* boaſt and proclaim their Charity that they have for the Church of *England*. their Doctrines and Proceedings declare us to be all Heathens and are very cruel to us, as I ſhall examine elſewhere. What an Infatuation muſt theſe People be in, to ſit contented under the Tuition of ſuch Ignorant deceivers? And tho' in the primitive Church the People may have had a Vote of Approbation in the choice of ſome Church-Officers, their Authority and Commiſſion was handed to them from Chriſt's *Delegates*, the *Biſhops* of the *Chriſtian* Church, who only have Power from our great Maſter of Ordination. Therefore in the days of *Conſtantine*, when any of the Barbarous Nations were converted to the Faith, they required a Biſhop to be ſent to them for that purpoſe, that the Execution of the Miniſterial Function might be legal, and conformable to the Apoſtolick Pattern And in the latter Ages, ſome of the *Vaudois* ſought out an Orthodox Biſhop, to give ordination to their Miniſters.

I muſt here examine and anſwer the miſtakes and fallacies of Mr. *Joſeph Hook's*

3d Chapter of his *Apology*, where he affirms, *That the baptized Believers are a true Church of Chriſt.* He pretends himſelf an Apoſtle or Meſſenger amongſt theſe People, and tells us that he was ordained a Goſpel Miniſter by *Francis Stanley* and *Thomas Grantham*, the one a *Presbyter*, and the other a *Meſſenger* of the Churches, p. 37. the People electing him to theſe Offices againſt his will; now if neither *Stanley*, nor *Grantham*, nor the People, had Power from Chriſt, nor from any delegated by him to ordain this Man, What ſignifies their Ordination and Impoſition of Hands? No more than if he had been ordain'd by the *Turkiſh Cadis*, or the *Jewiſh Rabbies.* In this Chapter he promiſeth to prove this Sect to be a true Church of Chriſt, by being Gathered, Conſtituted, and Govern'd according to the Doctrine of our Bleſſed Saviour, and his Holy Apoſtles, in conformity to the Primitive Pattern; but how well he proves it, I purpoſe here to examine.

His firſt Poſition is, *That the Anabaptiſt Church's Gathering, is according to the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, and conformable to the Primitive Pattern.* This is falſe; for they can never prove that any Authority or Commiſſion is deriv'd to them from Chriſt to Preach the Goſpel and Baptize, as the Apoſtles had. Their proceedings have no warrant from God, or his bleſſed Son, or Holy Spirit; they are bold Uſurpers of the Sacred Function,

Function, Intruders into the Miniſtery, Promoters of Schiſm and Diviſion; neither are their proceedings anſwerable or conformable to the Apoſtolick Practices. They Baptized not only the Maſters and Miſtreſſes of Families upon their Profeſſion of Faith; but alſo their Houſholds, as that of *Lydia*, *Acts* 16. 15. and that of the Jaylor, *Acts* 16. 31, 33. But theſe deceivers exclude out of the Church a great part of our Houſholds, and will not admit them to the Seal of God's Covenant, which is Baptiſm; the *Apoſtles* were for Unity amongſt believers, but theſe are Separatiſts. The *Apoſtles* frequented the *Jewiſh* Synagogues, and correſponded with the former People of God in their Devotions in the Temple, and were conformable to *Moſes*, tho' he was out of date, for fear of giving offence. But theſe break of all Union with all ſincere and devout Chriſtians, treat them as *Heathens* and *Infidels*, and have forſaken their Churches and Communion as infectious, contrary to Chriſt's Command and Prayer; therefore they are Apoſtates. They are not for gathering, but for ſcattering the Church by their Pernicious Principles. Again, the *Holy Apoſtles* eſtabliſh'd but one Church in every City, all the faithful were there joyn'd in one fellowſhip; but theſe *Diſciples of Satan* have, in oppoſition to Chriſt's deſign in our Redemption, divided and canton'd themſelves from his true Church, into divers Synagogues or Conventicles, and ſince

ſeparate from one another; ſo great an influence has the foul and turbulent Spirit of Diviſion upon theſe deluded People, that they are not only ſeparated from us, but amongſt themſelves they are now Sub-divided into Eight or Nine Sects, that diſagree in many Articles; but agree in their enmity to our Eſtabliſh'd Church. Mr. *Hooke* mentions Twelve Cities where the Diſciples of Chriſt made profeſſion of the Faith, and ſaith, That they were not gathered in a *National Way*; as if an Union and Communion with and between all Chriſt's Diſciples in a Nation were a reproach to us and contrary to the Primitive Pattern. What a fooliſh exception is this, for a Meſſenger or an *Apoſtle* of *Chriſt?* Was not the *Jewiſh Church* a *National Church* of God? Had not they Infant Members? And when whole Nations were converted to Chriſtianity, did they not all agree in one form of Worſhip? And ſuch as did thus agree, as the *Greek*, the *Egyptian*, the *Roman*, &c. Were not theſe National Churches of Chriſt in the Primitive Times? They had no *Anabaptiſts* to quarrel at their Unity and Agreement; but all Orthodox and true Diſciples were obedient and conformable to the Publick Orders and Conſtitutions. And as for the Baptiſm of Infants, and admitting them to be Church-Members, I have already proved it to have been the Command of Chriſt, and the Practice of the Apoſtles and Church of God in all Ages. Therefore our

Meſſenger's

Meſſenger's ſaying, That they only have the true *Ancient Primitive* or *Apoſtolical* mark of Church *Gathering*, is altogether falſe, and an Impudent Aſſertion, contrary to their true and known Practice; for did ever any of the Apoſtles Baptize Men into any particular Sect, as the *Anabaptiſts* are wont to dip their Proſelytes, and engage them to renounce all Communion with all Chriſtians. Did they inſtill in and oblige them to ſuch pernicious principles of Diviſion? Does not St. *Paul* plead for Unity, and enjoyn all Chriſt's Diſciples to Love, Union, and mutual Fellowſhip in the Publick Worſhip of God? *Epheſ.* 4. Does not he tell the *Romans*, *c.* 16, 17. *I beſeech you Brethren, mark them which cauſe Diviſion and Offences contrary to the Doctrine which ye have Learned, and avoid them?* Can any Man of reaſon judge theſe *Anabaptiſts*, acting ſo contrary to the Mind of Chriſt, and the Doctrine of the Apoſtles and their Practice in gathering their Churches, to be Apoſtolical, and according to the Primitive Pattern? The Second Aſſertion is as falſe as the firſt; That their *Church Conſtitution was according to the Primitive Pattern*, Here I obſerve, that Mr. *Hooke*, this pretended *Apoſtle* of *Chriſt* underſtands not the Right Conſtitution of a Church of God; for contrary to what he ſays, Churches may be rightly gathered, and yet the Conſtitution may be Irregular, Unwarrantable and Erroneous. To inform him, A true Church of Chriſt is a Society of Chri-

ſtians, Men, Women, and Children, lawfully call'd out of the World by the Preaching of the word, and the Right Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, to the Participation of Grace and Glory; and tho' there may be many particular parts of this Church diſtinguiſh'd in a Nation into ſeveral Pariſhes or Congregations, and in the World diſtinguiſh'd into ſeveral Nations, yet this Church is ſaid to be but *One* in *Chriſt*, *Gal.* 3. 28. and *Epheſ.* 4 4. The *Apoſtle* perſwades them to the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, becauſe there is but *one Body*, one Myſtical Body, into which they had been Baptized by *one Baptiſm.* Likewiſe Chriſt promiſeth, *John* 10. 16. That all his Sheep ſhall be brought together, and *there ſhall be one Fold, and one Shepherd.* They are to be brought by the Preaching of the word, by Faith and gentle means, and not by Violence nor Compulſion. We are not for Perſecutions, we abhor the late methods derived from Popiſh Practices, Principles and Councils; but there is one material thing required in a Church of Chriſt, a lawful Miniſtry by Chriſt's Appointment and Ordination, deriving from him their Authority, and not from the People. For *Chriſt's Church* is a *Monarchy*, not a *Democracy*; and he is the King as well as Supreme Prophet of his People; and as the Congregation have no Liberty to invent new Articles of Faith, and new Adminiſtrations, neither have they Power to appoint new Adminiſtrators.

The

The Texts he mentions, 1 *Cor.* 12. 18, 27, 28. ſpeak againſt him; for God, not the Mob, has appointed chief Officers to act in Chriſt's name in the Church; therefore when he ſaith that their Miniſtry is of a divine Authority, it is falſe. It concerns them to prove the Divinity of their Miſſion, which we deny. To tell us, *That they have three ſorts of Ordained Officers amongſt them, to wit,* Meſſengers, Elders and Deacons, *which we find to have been in the firſt Churches,* anſwers not the Queſtion. **What ſignifies the aſſigning ſuch names conformable to the Primitive Pattern to their Officers? Does only the name give them the Authority of Chriſt's Miniſters? We deny their Commiſſion to be from God, whatever Titles they give them,** and cannot look upon them but as Satan's Agents and Chaplains, while they promote his Empire, as really they do. Mr. *Hooke* hath not one Syllable to prove the Divine Authority of their *Anabaptiſt Officers*, as he pretended, neither can he or any of his party make it appear, that their Power is from Chriſt, but only from an Heretical Conventicle of their Sect. *Faſting* and *Prayer* may be practis'd by them in imitation of the firſt *Chriſtians*; for we often find the *Devil God's Ape*, and his *Factors* perſonating *Chriſt's Miniſters*. That there were *Apoſtles*, or *Angels*, or *Meſſengers*, in the Primitive Church, beſides the chief *Apoſtles*, proves not the matter in Queſtion; for they were call'd and ſet apart by the *Holy Ghoſt*,

Acts 13. 2, 4. *Epheſ.* 4. 11. They had their Commiſſion from God, and were inabled for the Miniſtry with the Gift of Tongues by the Holy Ghoſt in an extraordinary manner, and were ſent abroad by the *Apoſtles*, *Chriſt's immediate Agents*: But how comes the *Anabaptiſt Teachers* to be *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*? They muſt prove their Miſſion to be *Ordinary* or *Extraordinary*; if *Ordinary*, it muſt be from them who are Chriſt's Subſtitutes here on Earth, which none can pretend to be, but the Biſhops, who have derived their Authority lineally from the *Apoſtles*, as may be proved from Age to Age till this Time. If they pretend to an *Extraordinary Miſſion*, we expect from them a *Miracle* to evidence it, as was uſual in ſuch caſes, both in the *Old* and *New Teſtament*; for we are not to be ſatisfied with empty boaſting and vain pretences. Their calling the Names of their *Officers* as the *Apoſtolick* Churches did, is no Proof of the ſame Authority as was veſted in them, 1 *Cor.* 4. 9, 20. But Mr. *Hooke* diſowns amongſt them any *Extraordinary Call*, neither can he prove an *Ordinary one*, ſuch as is agreeable with the Holy Scripture, ſuch as is evidently derived to them from Chriſt or his Commiſſioned *Apoſtles*.

To diſpute about the Alteration of the Names of the Church Officers, is not material to our Purpoſe: I ſuppoſe we can prove that

that we retain yet the ſame Names as were in uſe in the Primitive Church, of *Biſhops*, who ſucceeded to the *Apoſtles* in their Authority and Command in the Church; of *Presbyters* or *Elders*, who aſſiſted the *Biſhops* in Preaching, and of *Deacons*. To quarrel at the Name of *Prieſt* which is, as we underſtand it, an Abbreviation of the Name of *Presbyter*, is childiſh and ridiculous; for Names depend upon the Uſage of the Country, and come from the Choice of Men, and are innocent and inſignificant in themſelves, without the Senſe that is given to them by Cuſtom. And as our Adverſaries approve of the Name of *Presbyter*, in the Offices of Chriſt, the Name of *Prieſt* is the ſame in our Meaning, as the other is to them. Let them not dream of Sacrifices and Offerings, when we call an Order in the Church by that ancient Title; tho' in that Reſpect and Signification the Name may be proper to them, when in the publick they offer up the Spiritual Sacrifices of Prayers and Praiſes of the Congregation to God. And if that Name may be proper to every Believer upon that account, according to St *Peter*'s Saying, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. as Mr. *Hooke* acknowledges, How much rather ought ſuch to be dignified with that Title, who are the Repreſentatives of their People, to offer up their Supplications and Thankſgivings to the Throne of Grace? Therefore his Exception is frivolous, *That he does not find that the*

Goſpel Church ſhould have any ſuch ordained Officers.

He endeavours next to prove, That true Ordination is certainly found in the Baptized Church. *Firſt*, Becauſe as he ſays, *They have true Baptiſm*; which we deny: For tho' the *Anabaptiſts* may have *Right Subjects*, who profeſs their Faith, a *Right Matter*, Water, *Right Words*, which ſome have not, who baptize them only in the Name of the *Lord Jeſus*, a *Right Manner* which we queſtion not; yet they have not Right Adminiſtrators, impower'd by Chriſt to execute that Office, and I think every Lay Diſciple is allow'd by them to dip their Proſelytes. Beſides, their Dipping being a Renunciation of the former Baptiſm, is not into the Church of Chriſt, but into their Pernicious Sect, as may appear by the Engagement they enter into at that time, contrary to the Mind of our Redeemer, and tending to Schiſm and Diviſion. For theſe Reaſons we look upon their Baptiſm to be criminal, an Apoſtacy from their former Profeſſion, a meer Nullity as to the Remiſſion of Sins, and no otherwiſe than if they had been Dipped by the *Turkiſh Caliphs* or *Muſties*, or their *Derviſes*. And as it is in oppoſition to their former lawful Baptiſm, 'tis Seditious, Heretical and Irregular.

He adds: *Now Baptiſm precedes Ordination; and where there is no true Baptiſm, there can be no Right Ordination, in an Ordinary way.* Here the

the *Friendly Hypocrite* pulls off his Mask, and tells us in plain Terms, That as we have no true *Baptiſm* in our Church, our *Ordinations* of Church Officers, of *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, and *Deacons*, are null and inſignificant; That we are no Miniſters of *Chriſt*; That our Preaching and Adminiſtrations are vain, *&c.* How many Lamentable Conſequences may we gather from this *Friendly Doctrine?* Is this the Kindneſs Mr. *Hooke* profeſſeth for our Church and Miniſtry, to blow us all up at once? Here this Spawn of the Jeſuit diſcovers his Malice at the Church of *England*; but as I have proved, by Holy Scripture and Right Reaſon, our Mode of Baptiſm to be Good, and the Subjects to be agreeable to the Will and Command of Chriſt, I ſhall not here contend with this Viper, that labours to ſting to Death the Boſom that harbours him and his Party, and grants them a Toleration.

As to the Populous Elections of the Church Officers; I deny that the People have any ſuch Power or Right from Chriſt, to appoint *Biſhops* or *Presbyters* in the Church, which we find depending upon Chriſt and his Holy Spirit, and exerciſing a Function in the Church, not derived to them from the People, as I have already proved. So *Acts* 14. 23. and elſewhere, the Apoſtles are ſaid to ordain Elders in every Church; 'tis ſuppos'd, not without the Cognizance of the People, who had nothing to object againſt them, but gave

gave them their Approbation. But as Christ's Dominion in his Church is *Monarchical* the Right and Power of *Ordination* is not lodg'd, nor committed to the Body of the People, but to the *Apostles* and their *Successors*, the *Bishops* of the Christian Church, as I could prove more at large, from the Word of God and Primitive Antiquity. Therefore what Mr. *Hooke* saith, *That they have Christ's lawful Ministers, qualified, chosen and ordained, according to the Word of God, is altogether false.* For the Government that they have amongst them, I have little to say; but that the Definition of a True Church in our 19th *Article*, agrees with their Church I deny; for I can prove they are several Distinct Congregations instead of Faithful Men, of *Apostates*; and that neither the true Word of God is Preach'd amongst them, nor the Sacraments duly Administred according to Christ's Ordinance, as I have already made it appear. And some of them are. *Seventh-day Baptists*, *Pelagians*, *Socinians*, *Fifth-monarchy Men*, *Antinomians*, *Soul Sleepers*, &c And have these and other Hereticks amongst them, the Word of God purely preach'd who are guilty of *Horrid Blasphemies*, as I could prove? Let them not appeal to their *Confessions of Faith*, they are publish'd to deceive the World. Not one Congregation, believes all the Articles as are there laid down, but differ from them in several Particulars. And 'tis remarkable, tho'

tho' by the Act of Toleration, they are oblig'd to ſign and ſubſcribe to moſt of the Articles of our Church, to capacitate them to hold their *Conventicles*, they can with a *Jeſuitical Equivocation*, and *Mental Reſervation*, ſign to what they don't believe, profeſs, nor teach. What can we think of ſuch Preachers? Are theſe Apoſtolick or truly Chriſtian? I ſhall examine the other Part of Mr. *Hooke*'s Apology, and diſcover by the Word of God and Reaſon, his pernicious Deluſions and Fallacies, next to Mr. *Stennet*'s.

Now my Anſwerer *R. Morgan* proceeds on in his Miſtakes, from the Beginning to the End of the Chapter. *For I think it*, ſaith he, *no Diſhonour for a true Miniſter of Chriſt to labour as* Paul *did when neceſſity requires.* But to chuſe ſuch Men to be Teachers of the People, who know nothing but their Mechanick Trades, who were never bred up but in ſecular Employs, nor qualified for the Function by any former Studies, and who have no other internal Call, but from their Pride, Hypocriſy, Ambition, Vain-glory, deſire of Gain, *&c.* nor no other outward, but the ſuffrages of the Mob and common People, who are willing and ready to gratify ſuch as are likely to promote their Intereſt, and increaſe their Numbers: We may confidently affirm ſuch Men to be no Miniſters of Chriſt, nor to have any lawful Ordination. He tells us of *Epictetus* an Eminent Philoſo-

pher,

pher, formerly a Slave; and *Ammonius* a Carrier of Sacks of Corn, who after they had applied themſelves to ſtudy, became Eminent in Learning; and the Diſciples, Prophets, and Apoſtles, were all inſpired with the Spirit of God. What is this to our Caſe? Are the Leathern, Blue, and Green-Apron Teachers, amongſt the *Anabaptiſts*, inſpired with a Divine Spirit, and inabled by the Holy Ghoſt for the Function, as the Apoſtles were? He concludes and ends as he began his ſcandalous Pamphlet, by baſe Reflections, uncivil Language, falſe Aſperſions and Accuſations, that deſerve no other Anſwer from me but Contempt and Scorn. Now I leave him to the Judgment of him, who ſaith, *That Vengeance belongeth to me, I will recompence, ſaith the Lord.* And again, *The Lord ſhall judge his People*, Heb. 10. 30. I leave him to the Juſtice of my Great Lord and Maſter, who declares, *That he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me; and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.* We are the true Miniſters of Chriſt, theſe Innovators are but Intruders into the Miniſtry, and as Chriſt names them, Thieves and Robbers, *John* 10. 1. We can produce our lawful Calls, both inward and outward; Theſe have no other Authority to ſhew but the Suffrages of a Crue or Company of deluded People: We have Power to act in the Church, as the Servants of Chriſt, and Stewards of the Myſteries of God; but theſe

are

are no Miniſters of Chriſt, but Promoters of the Devil's Intereſt and Kingdom, by ſpreading abroad their Heretical Doctrines and Erroneous Principles. I think I don't break through the Rules of Modeſty, nor uſe any unbecoming Language to give theſe Uſurpers of the Sacred Function, theſe Deceivers of the Nation their Right Titles, and in Imitation of Chriſt and of his Holy Apoſtles, to reprove them for their Hypocriſy and Form of Godlineſs, and denying the Power thereof; for the Cruelty to their Infants, to ſhut them out of the Covenant of Grace, unto which Chriſt invites them; for their uncharitable Cenſure of all *Proteſtant Churches*, by judging their Baptiſm null, and their Condition no better than that of Heathens; for ſpreading abroad, and impoſing upon the People falſe Doctrines to gain Proſelytes; and for their Injuſtice to offer to diſpoſſeſs our Infants of a Right they have peaceably enjoy'd above Fifteen Hundred Years, without any Contradiction, upon an idle and falſe Pretence, that 'tis not expreſly mention'd in the *New Teſtament*. They have not one tittle in the Word of God to favour their pernicious Hereſy, when rightly underſtood; nor any thing from the beſt and pureſt Antiquity, to ſupport their Cauſe, as we have made it appear: Therefore *R. M.* concludes his Pamphlet with almoſt as many Falſities as Sentences.

But

But now 'tis time to leave him to God and his Condemnation, to examine a few of Mr. *Stennet*'s Reflections, a more Civil, a more Rational and Learned Adversary, on Mr. R's Sixth Chapter, concerning the *Anabaptists Teachers*, of whom I have been discourfing. We grant, that *a secular Employment, in case of necessity, is not unbecoming a Minister of Christ*; but to chuse from thence the most part of your *Elders* or *Bishops*, and *Messengers*, as you call them, is scandalous. And those who have no Authority derived from Christ, to warrant such Men to Preach and Administer the Sacraments, What a sad Condition are your People in, who depend upon such Impostors, and Counterfeit Ministers of Christ, and follow such blind Guides, in the great Business of their Salvation? 'Tis true, *that the Restriction of the Priesthood to one Tribe under the Law, does not confine the Ministry under the Gospel only to Men of one Tribe or Nation, or to those of one Rank and Condition, as to their temporal Circumstances*: But yet, as they had a Call from God to execute that Function amongst his *Jewish* People, none ought now to presume to take any Ecclesiastical Office upon him, or to act in Christ's Church in his Name, and by his Authority without a lawful Commission from God, which he ought to produce, and satisfy others, as well as his own Conscience, of his just Right and Power. And 'tis a pernicious Doctrine and Inlet to all disorder in this

this caſe, to tell us in their publick Confeſſion, That the *Work of Preaching the Word is not ſo peculiarly confin'd to the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Churches*, but that *others alſo, gifted and fitted by the Holy Spirit for it, and approved and called by the Church, may and ought to perform it.* Theſe Gifted Men they underſtand to be inſpired from above by Miracle, without the Laborious Study of Divinity or Languages; and by their Church, the Meeting of their People together of all ſorts and Conditions of Men and Women. But how came they by their Right of chuſing Chriſt's Miniſters without his Warrant? which we deny was ever granted to them from our Redeemer? Theſe Mechanicks therefore are no lawful Miniſters of our Lord, no rightful Adminiſtrators of God's Ordinances; their Authority is vain, their dipping in God's and Chriſt's Name unwarrantable, and not for the Remiſſion of Sins, but into their pernicious Sect; and their Baptiſm is null, void, and of no Effect. 'Tis true, *Eliſha* was call'd to that Sacred Work from the Plow, *David* from the Sheepfold, and *Amos* from the Herd; but theſe and others were nominated by God, as *Aaron* was, and inabled with many Divine Gifts and Graces, for the better diſcharge of their Function; but none will ſay, that the Blue, Green, and Leathern-Apron Preachers, are thus inſpired from above, or have the Holy Spirit for that purpoſe. Mr. *Stennet* grants

an

an inward and an outward Call to be neceſſary in all ſuch as undertake the Miniſtry: Now we cannot judge theſe Men to have either, for that intended purpoſe. But my Anſwerer ſeems to allow, that ſome of the *Anabaptiſts* Teachers run before they are ſent, and theſe they diſown. They would do well to put upon all they ordain, a *Character* of Diſtinction, as the Church of *Rome* does upon all their Prieſtly Order, by ſhaving their Crowns; and as the *Turks*, at the Circumciſion of the Adult and Renegado's, by printing a Half Moon upon their Breaſts; that we may know who is a Miniſter ſent, and who is not; who is an approved Teacher of the *Anabaptiſts*, and who is not. As for the Names they beſtow upon them, of *Biſhops*, or *Elders*, and *Meſſengers*, or *Apoſtles*, 'tis to be obſerv'd, that they have inverted, in their Confeſſion of Faith, the Order of Chriſt's Eſtabliſhment, by naming the Latter after the Former, whereas they ought to be before: But their whole Sect is a Subverſion of Chriſt's Laws and Ordinances; therefore this is not one of the leaſt Errors that they are guilty of. Now, for the Honour of their Teachers, they muſt give me leave to publiſh a Liſt of their Names and Occupations of as many as I could get, and of the Places of their Abode and Meeting-Houſes in and about *London* which the Reader may ſee at the End of this Book.

Argument

Arguments taken from Mr. Baxter's *plain Scripture Proof of Infant Church-Membership and Baptiſm.*

THis excellent Man, as he tells us in his Preface, was doubtful at firſt what to think of the *Anabaptiſts*; but after he had examin'd the Word of God, and the Records of *Antiquity*, they fix'd his Judgment, and ſettled his Mind in relation to this Controverſy. Therefore he writ in oppoſition to Mr. *Tombes*, choſen Lecturer of *Bewdley*, who endeavour'd to perſwade all his Congregation to be Dipped by him, and Preach'd ſeveral Sermons for that purpoſe; but was very angry, that his Exhortations made no greater Impreſſion upon his People. Mr. *Baxter* therefore, to prevent the Miſchiefs of *Anabaptiſm* in thoſe Parts, writes this Book, and begins with Ten Poſitions, that he lays down for the better underſtanding the Queſtion in diſpute. *Firſt*, That the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks of ſome things in Scripture more fully, and of others more ſparingly; the latter is doubtleſs the more difficult to underſtand, yet a Divine Truth. In four Caſes God ſpeaks more ſparingly; of the Salvation of Heathens, and of their Infants; yet he is pleas'd to diſtinguiſh between the Children of Believers, and of Infidels. God ſpeaks more ſparingly of Mat-

ters

ters of leſſer moment; but of thoſe that are of an abſolute neceſſity to Salvation, more fully. God ſpeaks more fully of the things that were diſputed in thoſe Times, and of others more ſparingly. Again, The *New Teſtament* ſpeaks more ſparingly of the things revealed in the *Old*. Both being the Word of God, there was no need of a Repetition of God's Will, ſo fully and ſufficiently revealed in the former: This is our Caſe. The Queſtion is not, By what Sign Members are to be admitted into the Church; or, Whether by a Sign or without; but at What Age they are to be admitted? Now this is expreſly commanded by God in the *Old Teſtament*, What need of any New Order to that Purpoſe, ſince he hath ſo plainly revealed his Will in the *Old Teſtament*, and ſignified his Pleaſure in the *New*, tho' not ſo clearly? We have divers Caſes parallel to this, as the Degrees of Marriage forbidden in the *Old*, and not in the *New*; yet 'tis a ſinful Act to violate a Law that was there prohibited. So likewiſe the Scripture in the *New Teſtament* is ſilent in relation to a Chriſtian Magiſtracy, and the Obſervation of the *Lord's Day* with that Devotion, as the *Jewiſh Sabbath* was obſerved; yet we doubt not but that our Obedience is required by God to thoſe Laws, ſo plainly expreſſed in the *Old Teſtament*.

The

The *Second* Poſition is, That the difficulty in finding out the Truth, and God's Will in any Queſtion, is no Proof that 'tis not of God; for 'tis his Pleaſure thereby to exerciſe our Faith, Obedience, Inquiſition, and Study in Divine Matters.

The *Third* Poſition is, That if Truth appears never ſo plain it may not be able to convince ſuch as are prejudiced againſt it by Education, Intereſt, Cuſtom, Pre-occupation, Ignorance, *&c.* Therefore Truth is not to be undervalued becauſe ſuch Men reject it, who are thus miſled, and Enemies of it. Neither are we to think the worſe of Truth, becauſe Men of Learning or Conſcience oppoſe it.

The *Fourth* Poſition is, That when a Caſe appears to us not ſo clear and certain as may be expected, we ought to incline to the greateſt Probability. Now I dare appeal to any indifferent Perſon, Whether 'tis the Mind of Chriſt to exclude Infants out of his Covenant? he having been ſo favourable to invite them to him. And as there is no other outward Method appointed for their Admiſſion, but Baptiſm, Whether 'tis not his Will, that they ſhould be Baptized?

The *Fifth* Poſition is, That wiſe and conſciencious Chriſtians are not to be too raſh in changing their Judgments in Matters of Religion, ſince divers Errors are damnable, and of a pernicious Conſequence, as this now

now in queſtion; they ought to deſire God's aſſiſtance by Prayer, examine well the Matter in diſpute, hear both Parties, before they alter their Opinions; and conſult thoſe whom God hath ſet over them to inſtruct them, or others, who may be better able to adviſe them. They are to take heed, that they be not inveigled with an Appearance of Sanctity, nor cheated by deceitful Arguments, nor terrified by vain Notions; but to allow to themſelves time and means, to conſider and conſult in a Caſe, where the Salvation of their Souls is ſo highly concern'd.

The *Sixth* Poſition is, That the overthrow of a Man's former weak Grounds, is not the overthrow of the Truth, which he held; for it may be ſupported by other ſtronger Arguments, that we may be ignorant of: Therefore to renounce our Orthodox Perſwaſion, becauſe of our Miſtakes, and know not how to maintain it by Scripture or Reaſons, upon which we formerly depended, is a great Indiſcretion and Error.

The *Seventh* Poſition, That when ſome Men have been baffled by others of a greater reach of Wit and Learning, and their weak Performances and Arguments anſwer'd with the Adverſaries applauſe, it ought to be no prejudice to the Truth that they maintain. 'Tis not to be denied, that ſome have argued very weakly for *Infant-Baptiſm*, uſed many unfit Phraſes, and quoted

quoted many miſapplied Texts of Scripture: There is no difficulty to Triumph and overcome ſuch an *Adverſary*, who furniſhes his *Antagoniſt* with Weapons to beat him, by Contradictions, Inconſiſtences, obſcure Expreſſions, or want of Senſe, that he may be guilty of; for all that, the Truth and Cauſe that he maintains ought not to ſuffer by it, while others can vindicate and prove the Matter in queſtion: A School-Boy of *Weſtminſter*, may ridicule the moſt undoubted Truths with his flaſhy Wit.

The *Eighth* Poſition is, That one ſound Argument is ſufficient to prove any thing true, if all others ſhould fail. Error hath no real Foundation, neither in Scripture, nor in ſound Reaſon; but Truth is eſtabliſhed upon both. Two Witneſſes are required amongſt Men, to juſtify Truth; but God's ſingle Witneſs in one Text of Scripture, is as good as Ten Thouſand. Tho' we have many to prove our Belief and Practice, in relation to *Infant-Baptiſm*, ſome may be affected with, and better comprehend one more than another.

The *Ninth* Poſition is, That the former and preſent Cuſtoms of the Churches of Chriſt, Orthodox in their Belief and Practices, ought to be of ſome weight with prudent and conſiderate Chriſtians, in Caſes controverted and beyond their reach. We have proved *Infant-Baptiſm* to be the Uſage of the Chriſtian Church, as near to the Apoſtles

Apoſtles Days as there is any ſufficient Hiſtory extant to inform us. And for the preſent Churches of Chriſt, none excepted, they all Baptize Infants: Certainly they and we cannot all be in an Error, and only a few *Mechanick Anabaptiſts*, for the moſt part, of the Dregs of the People, in the Right; when we have at leaſt as much Learning and Divine Aſſiſtances as they can pretend to

The *Tenth* Poſition is, That plain Conſequences and Arguments drawn by Reaſon from Scripture, are as ſufficient proof as the expreſs Words of a Text. The Words without the Meaning and Reaſon, are inſignificant; but the right Meaning and Reaſon are proof enough. The Devil made uſe of Words of Scripture againſt Chriſt, as the *Anabaptiſts* do againſt us; but both want the Meaning and Reaſon on their ſide, as we have made it appear. Chriſt's proving to the *Sadducees* the Immortality of the Soul, and Reſurrection of the Dead, from God's ſaying, *I am the God of* Abraham, *of* Iſaac, *and of* Jacob is a notable Inſtance in this Caſe —— This was no plain proof of either Doctrine; but by this Reaſon *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* If we imitate our Saviour in his reaſoning upon Holy Scripture, I don't think we ſhall abuſe or pervert it, or add any thing to it, as my rude and uncivil Adverſary charges me.

Now

Now I cannot but enumerate here the diſmal Conſequences of this pernicious and helliſh Doctrine of the *Anabaptiſts*, as Mr. *Baxter* hath ſet them down: They all deny Infants their Church Membership, and room in the Viſible Church, and a ſhare in the Covenant of Grace, unleſs when they join with the *Antinomians*, and tell us of an abſolute Covenant, and call God's Election (of which none can be certain without complying with the Means) his *Covenant*: They deny the natural Intereſt which Parents have in their Children, to make a *Covenant* in their Names, and for them: They call that common and unclean, which God hath called Holy: They give us a new Model of the Viſible Church, of their own Invention in the Materials of it: They provoke Chriſt to anger, in forbidding Children to be brought to him into his Church: They are ſo audacious, as to repeal a part of the *Old Teſtament*, which they can never prove, that God hath repealed: They deprive Parents of all Aſſurance of the Salvation of their Children, who die unbaptized, without which they can have no undoubted Right to the Promiſes of God: They deny them an Entrance into Chriſt's Viſible Church, which admits of indifferent Chriſtians; They leave them in the ſame polluted State of Nature, as the Children of *Turks* and *Infidels*: They make the Diſpenſation under the Law,

to be more favourable than that of the Goſpel: They make the *Jews*, who believed in Chriſt, to be great Loſers by his Coming: They would have God to diſown his Creatures, before they have forſaken or offended him, and puniſh them for the Sins of others: Their Doctrine tends to perſwade us, that God hath broken his Covenant with our Children, and is more inclinable to Severity to them, than Mercy: They leſſen the free Grace of the Goſpel, and deny their Children the Mercies Chriſt hath purchaſed for them: They play the Devil's part, in accuſing their Children, and in diſputing them out of the Church, out of the Covenant, and Promiſes of God annex'd to it.

Theſe are the Effects and Conſequences of this pernicious Doctrine of the *Anabaptiſts*, That Infants are not to be Baptized. Mr. *Baxter* proves that they are:

Firſt, By Chriſt's Commiſſion deliver'd to his Apoſtles, to *go and Diſciple all Nations*, &c. wherein Infants are included; which Argument we have already examin'd. And it plainly appears, that the Holy Ghoſt names ſome Infants *Diſciples*, *Acts* 15. 10. If ſo, they are to be admitted to the Privilege of Chriſt's Diſciples, which is Baptiſm, as we have already obſerved.

Secondly, All that are capable of being Servants of God, are capable of being Diſciples: Now Infants are capable of being God's

God's Servants; they are ſo named, *Levit.* 25. 41, 42. there the *Iſraelites* are commanded, in the Day of *Jubile*, to let their Brother that was ſold to them, and his Children, to be ſet at liberty; becauſe God declares them to be his Servants. Children are here included, and ſtiled God's Servants, tho' they were ſo young, that they could do him no ſervice; yet, if God owns them to be his Diſciples and Servants, we have no reaſon to deny them that Honour, nor the Privileges that belong to that Relation.

Thirdly, If Infants are capable to be Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom, they are capable to be his Diſciples; but they are capable of the one, as Chriſt ſaith, therefore of the other. Chriſt's Viſible Church is nam'd his Kingdom, or his School; therefore every Member of it is under him, and related to him, as a King, or a Prophet. Now Children are declared to be fit for his Kingdom, as Subjects of it; therefore they ought to be enter'd into it by the means appointed, that is, by Baptiſm.

Fourthly, If all ſuch as are capable to be Church-Members and Chriſtians, are to be Baptized, as it is plain by Chriſt's expreſs Order. And all Infants of Believers are reckon'd of that Number, *for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, that is fit and capable of being Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom, and Members of his Church, and Chriſtians;

Therefore Infants are conſequently to be baptized at their firſt Admiſſion.

Fifthly, St. *Paul* ſaith, *Eph.* 5. 26. That *Chriſt ſanctifieth and cleanſeth his Church by the waſhing of Water through the Word.* If Chriſt's whole Church is to be thus ſanctified and cleanſed by the waſhing of Water and the Word, then Children of Believers, who are to belong to Chriſt's Church, muſt be ſo ſanctified and cleanſed, by this waſhing of Water, or Baptiſm, and by the Word of God, or the Word of Promiſes, annex'd to the Ordinance, and applied to the Party Baptized by the Miniſter in Chriſt's name, and by the Efficacy of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Sanctification.

Sixthly, If by the Mercy and Appointment of God not yet repealed, ſome Infants were to be Members of his Viſible Church, and enter'd into his Covenant, then ſome Infants are to be admitted ſtill: His Mercy and Inclination to them being as great as ever, and they as capable of it under the Goſpel, as under the Law, and no greater Impediment appearing on either ſide. If this be granted, which cannot reaſonably be denied but by Ignorance, or Obſtinacy, we muſt from hence inferr, that they are now to be admitted by that Ordinance, that Chriſt hath appointed for that purpoſe, as they were to be admitted then by that Method, which was then in uſe by the ſame Authority. Does not this rea-

reaſoning conclude that our Infants are neceſſarily to be admitted into his Church and Covenant, by Baptiſm? And tho' the *Jewiſh* Church-Conſtitution was aboliſh'd, the State of Believers and of their Children was the ſame; the Mercy and Goodneſs of God is as favourable to us, and ours, as ever he was to them: Therefore the Objection that implies the contrary is vain, frivolous, and of no weight in our caſe. Again, Before the *Jewiſh* Church was eſtabliſh'd, Infants were received into Covenant with God, by his expreſs Order; therefore this Order was no part of the Levitical or Ceremonial Law of *Moſes*, that was to be aboliſh'd by our Redeemer, tho' the particular Sign and Seal was made a part of that Law, and appropriated to it, as an Obligation on the *Iſraelites*, to obſerve the Contents of that Law. And as that gracious and general Order, that tends to enter our Children at Eight Days old, was never repealed by God, we are to judge, that it continues ſtill in force under the Goſpel; therefore as Children were then enrolled by Circumciſion, we have Chriſt's warrant for the ſame Reaſon, to admit our Infants by Baptiſm, the outward diſtinguiſhing Sign and Seal of our Profeſſion.

Seventhly, But to yield a little to our Adverſaries, ſuppoſe God ſhould have aboliſh'd this Order, and does not allow that Children ſhould be brought into Covenant with him

der the Goſpel, till they can make Profeſſion of their Faith, as they declare: This *Alteration* is from a Motive of Mercy or Juſtice, either for their good or for their hurt; but neither of theſe can reaſonably be imagin'd to be the Cauſes of their *Excluſion:* Not Mercy, for the merciful Nature of God never revokes a Mercy, but grants a greater in lieu of it: Neither can it be a Mercy to deprive our Infants of ſo great a Mercy, as ſuch an intimate Relation to him, as is procured in Baptiſm: Nor can Juſtice be the Motive of this change, for God never exerciſes his Juſtice, but with thoſe who firſt break Covenant with him. And is it probable that he ſhould admit the Children of the former Diſpenſation into Covenant with him, and offer under a more favourable Diſpenſation, to excommunicate our Babes, as unfit and unworthy of his favour to the *Jewiſh?* Or can this *Excommunication* be interpreted as a Mercy to them, to be out of the Church, and out of the Covenant with God, in the poluted State of Nature? Such as are receiv'd within, have God ingaged in an Oath or Promiſe, to be their God. And is it a Mercy to your Children, *Blind Leaders of the Blind!* to deprive your Infants of this gracious Promiſe, of which they can have no Aſſurance, and to which they can have no right nor appa-

apparent Title, without Baptiſm, this Seal of the Goſpel Covenant?

Eighthly, If the Church of Chriſt be not in a worſe State now, in regard of their Childrens happineſs, and their Parents comfort therein, than it was before Chriſt's coming, then our Children ought to be Church-Members. But certainly the Chriſtian Church is not in a worſe condition than the *Jewiſh* was formerly, in this reſpect, and in all others, as may be proved from *Heb.* 8. 6. *Jeſus is the Mediator of a better Covenant, eſtabliſhed upon better Promiſes.* Heb. 7. 22. *He is the Author of a better Teſtament.* Rom. 5. 14, 15, 20. *Where Sin abounded, Grace much more abounded.* And Eph. 3. 19. *The Love of Chriſt paſſeth Knowledge.* Don't all theſe and many other Texts declare our condition far better under the Goſpel, than the *Jewiſh* was under the Law? Have not we a better Covenant, better Promiſes, a far better and a more merciful Mediator? And all theſe Goſpel Advantages, Are they to belong to us, and not to our Children? Are thoſe innocent Babes only to be deprived of theſe excellent Benefits? Are they to be treated with more ſeverity than formerly, by ſo Merciful a Redeemer? Unleſs we imagine God's Mercies to be greater without his Church than within, certainly the Infants of believing Chriſtians excluded from the Covenant, are

in a worſe condition, than were the Children of believing *Jews.*

Ninthly, If Children of Believers be now put out of the Church by God's Appointment, they are in a worſe Condition than the Children of the *Gentiles* were before the coming of Chriſt; but that were moſt abſurd and falſe, ſo is the Antecedent. If this were true, the concluſion would neceſſarily follow: For, before Chriſt's coming, any *Gentile* proſelyted to the *Jewiſh* Religion, might have his Children, at Eight Days old, be received Members of God's Viſible Church; therefore if our Infants cannot have the ſame Privilege, they are in a worſe condition than thoſe were in. And is it probable, that Chriſt came to deſtroy, or deprive thoſe tender Souls, for whom he expreſſeth ſo great a Kindneſs and Love, as to hinder them of thoſe Advantages, that they enjoy'd ſo long before the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy? Certainly the Deſign of Chriſt in the Goſpel, is not to abridge, but to inlarge our Privileges, and the Privileges of our Children, and to grant us at leaſt as great. or greater Aſſurances of our and their Salvation.

Tenthly, If the Covenant that God made with the *Jews* and their little Ones, and with their Poſterity after them, in *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. was a Covenant of Grace, or a Goſpel Covenant, then it is not repealed, conſequently their Church-Member-

ſhip

ſhip is not repealed, being built on the Covenant. Now that was a Covenant of Grace, or a Goſpel Covenant into which Infants were enter'd then, as I ſhall make it appear; therefore their Church-Member-ſhip, that this Covenant ſuppoſeth, is not repealed. *All the Men of* Iſrael *that ſtood before the Lord, their little Ones, their Wives, and the Stranger that was in the Camp, did then enter into Covenant with the Lord their God, and into the Oath which the Lord their God made with them that Day, that he might eſtabliſh them that Day, for a People unto himſelf, and that he might be to them a God.* Take notice that the Covenant was made with their little Ones; and, That this Covenant was a Covenant of Grace, or a Goſpel Covenant; for that Covenant that promiſeth to *Circumciſe the Heart, and the Heart of their Seed, to love the Lord God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that they might live,* muſt needs be a Covenant of Grace; but this is promiſed, *Deut.* 30. 6. and ſuch a Covenant is a Covenant of Grace, the Author to the *Hebrews* proves it, *Heb.* 10. 16, 17. *I will put my Laws into their Hearts, and in their Minds will I write them.* St. *Paul* expreſſes it more plainly, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. *The Word is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart, that is, the Word of Faith which we preach.* Now the Apoſtle relates at large theſe Verſes of the Tenth of the

Romans, out of this Covenant of *Deuteronomy*, made with the Infants, which by St. *Paul*'s Application ſhews ſufficiently, that this was a Covenant of Grace, or a Goſpel Covenant, out of which our Infants are not to be excluded, and which was never repealed in relation to them; if it was, let our Adverſaries prove it.

Eleventhly, If God by his unchangeable Law and Promiſe, hath declar'd the Seed of the Righteous to be Bleſſed under the Goſpel, as well as under the Law, as *Pſal.* 37. 26. then certainly they are to be Members of his Viſible Church; for God never pronounced any other Society Bleſſed beſides, or out of his Church. This is an unchangeable Promiſe, relating to all Ages, and to the Righteous for ever, and to their Seed; and not to the *Jews* only, but to Chriſtians and their Infants, who are therefore to be admitted into the Church of God, that they might be capable of this Bleſſing deſign'd for them in that Text.

Twelfthly, That Doctrine that maketh Infants to be Members of the Viſible Kingdom of the Devil, is a falſe, and an abominable Doctrine; but that Doctrine, which denieth Infants to be Members of the Viſible Church of Chriſt, doth make them Members of the Viſible Kingdom of the Devil; therefore 'tis a falſe and abominable Doctrine. We may ſafely charge this Doctrine with the conſequence; for there

is

is no Third State. Whoſoever is not belonging to Chriſt's Viſible Kingdom, is yet in the World, and under the Prince of this World, or the God of this World, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. without God, and Chriſt, a Child of Wrath, *&c.* And tho' we are not to think all unbaptized Perſons to belong to the Kingdom of Satan, yet the Doctrine that excludes them out of Chriſt's Church and Covenant, tends to make them Members of the Devil's Kingdom and Empire, if not really, at leaſt doctrinally: For as the Church of Chriſt is a People called out of the World, *John* 15. 19. choſen and ſeparated by ſome diſtinguiſhing Sign or Inſtitution by our Saviour's Appointment; Whoſoever refuſeth to any, this diſtinguiſhing Sign of his Profeſſion, that is capable of it, or invited to it, ſhuts them out of Chriſt's Viſible Church, and as much as in them lies, condemns them to continue in the Kingdom of the God of this World, the Devil: For 'tis plain, that whoſoever is not admitted into Chriſt's Kingdom, is without it, *Coloſ.* 4. 5. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 12. and there is no admiſſion but by Baptiſm. Now Infants are either within, or without, they cannot be within, without a Reception; therefore they are without, and yet belonging to the World, of which Chriſt ſaith, that the Devil is the Prince, *John* 12. 31. and *John* 14. 30. What a pernicious Doctrine is this; And how blinded and inhumane

must

muſt Parents be to their new-born Babes, to leave them long in ſuch a State? And how uncomfortable a conſideration is it, to ſee them depart out of the World in that condition, out of Chriſt and his Viſible Church?

Thirteenthly, That Doctrine which affords us no apparent nor ſound Hope of the Juſtification or Salvation of any dying Infants, is undoubtedly falſe Doctrine; but that Doctrine that denieth Infants to be Members of the Viſible Church of Chriſt, and excludes them out of it, affords us no apparent nor ſound Hope of the Juſtification or Salvation of any dying Infants; therefore 'tis undoubtedly falſe Doctrine. The Major is plain; for as ſound Hope is guided by Judgment, which ought to have ſome evidence or proof to depend on; where there is no ſeeming nor viſibility, there can be no Evidence; therefore there can be no Judgment, and conſequently no ſound nor apparent Hope in this caſe. The Minor is as undoubted: That they that are not ſeemingly of the Church, are not ſeemingly or viſibly in a State of Salvation; the Holy Scripture decares it, for Chriſt *came to redeem his Church*, and thoſe are only to be ſaved, *whom the Father hath given him, who belong to this Church, choſen in him before the Foundation of the World, predeſtinated to the adoption of Children by Jeſus Chriſt, who are redeemed by his Blood,*

and

and receive the Forgiveneſs of Sins, &c. And as thoſe who belong not to Chriſt's Church and Kingdom, cannot expect theſe Advantages, there is no apparent nor ſound Hope of their Salvation: Neither is any Promiſe in God's Word to give us any ground to hope or believe any ſuch thing; but on the contrary, Such as were to be ſaved, the Lord added to the Church, *Acts* 2. 47. If our Adverſaries did ſeriouſly conſider in what danger they caſt their Children, in relation to their eternal Welfare, by denying to them Baptiſm, the Entrance into Chriſt's Viſible Church on Earth, they would doubtleſs alter their Perſwaſion, if they are moved with any Sentiments of Love and Affection for them. As we have no certainty of the Salvation of ſuch as are excluded out of Chriſt's Church, we have on the contrary the greateſt Aſſurance for them who belong to this Church; for *Chriſt is the Saviour of the Body*, and he will *ſanctify and cleanſe his Church, and preſent it unſpotted to the Father*. The Promiſes of God are fuller, to the Members of his Viſible Church, of Mercy and Pardon of Grace, Protection and Salvation; God is engaged by Covenant more to them than to others, and they are God's Heritage; And is it not a Madneſs in our Adverſaries, to deprive their own Children of all the Bleſſings and Advantages promiſed to Chriſt's Church and People, by refuſing them Baptiſm?

Four-

Fourteenthly, If an Infant was the Head of the Viſible Church, then Infants may be Members; but Chriſt, an Infant, was the Head of the Church, therefore Infants may be Members. That Chriſt in his Infancy, according to his Humane Nature, was the Head of his Church, the Viſion of Angels proclaim him to the Shepherds, and the Adoration of the Wiſe Men, witneſs him to be the Saviour Chriſt, the Lord and Head of his Church; therefore conſequently Infants may be with more reaſon Members of it. Therefore *Irenæus*, who lived near the Apoſtles Time, has theſe Expreſſions, *Chriſt went through every Age, and for Infants he was made an Infant, ſanctifying Infants, in little Children, he being a little Child, ſanctifying them, that have this very Age, and withal being made unto them an Example of Piety, and Righteouſneſs, and Subjection.* Is not here a clear Proof from Antiquity of Infants-Baptiſm or Church-Membership? For if they are ſanctified by Chriſt, and he himſelf became an Infant to ſanctify Infants, then doubtleſs they are Church-Members; which cannot be without Baptiſm.

Fifteenthly, In *Mark* 9. 36. 'Tis ſaid, that Chriſt took a Child, and ſet him in the midſt of them, and when he had taken him in his Arms, he ſaid unto them, *Whoſoever ſhall receive one of ſuch Children in my Name, receiveth me; and whoſoever ſhall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that ſent me.*

Doth

Doth Christ take them up in his Arms? And would he have us reject them, and shut them out of his Church? Can they be received in his Name by such as excommunicate them, and deny them to be his Disciples? Does Christ account the receiving of them, to be the receiving of himself and God the Father, and shall we refuse them to be Subjects of his Visible Kingdom? May we not inferr from hence, that he that will not receive them, refuseth to receive Christ? Since therefore this is the revealed Will of our Blessed Redeemer, and that we are all to be governed only by this revealed Will, as our Adversaries pretend; we judge it an hainous Crime, an horrid Impiety, a Condemnation of Christ's Wisdom, Mercy and Order, and a grievous Unjustice and Impiety, to reject Children, and to refuse them an Entrance into his Visible Church by Baptism.

Some

Some Remarks on Mr. Stennet's *Anſwer to Mr.* Ruſſen's *Book againſt the* Anabaptiſts.

I Deſign not to juſtify Mr. *Ruſſen* in all that he ſays, but only to vindicate the Truth, Doctrines, and Practices of the Church of *England*, in relation to Infant-Baptiſm, againſt the plauſible, but deceitful Arguments of his Anſwerer. He takes all occaſions to ridicule the Author, who gives him frequent opportunities to play upon him, to the apparent prejudice of the cauſe he maintains. Mr. *Stennet* firſt diſcants, or rather drolls upon the Title, *Fundamentals without Foundation.* He might have underſtood Mr. *Ruſſen*'s meaning, That the *Fundamentals* of the *Anabaptiſts*, of their *Hereſy* and *Schiſm*, have no Foundation either in Holy Scripture or Reaſon: This will appear to the Reader, by the peruſal of the Second Antidote. For the riſe of this Sect, Mr. *R*— is not much miſtaken; 'Tis not yet Two Hundred Years ago that it firſt appear'd; and for its Progreſs and Practice, is not ſo innocent as Mr. *Stennet* would perſwade the World; but the Danger and Wickedneſs of this perſwaſion, with the pernicious Conſequences, may be clearly diſcovered by the evidence that I have brought, and ſhall bring for that purpoſe.

purpoſe. Truly Mr. *Ruſſen* had cauſe, as we have all, to lament at the increaſe of this Heretical Sect, ſo deſtructive to the Souls of Infants, to the Peace of the Church and private Families, and to the diſgrace of Chriſtianity. Mr. *Stennet* has no reaſon to compare his innovations and unwarrantable Principles with the Divine Doctrines publiſh'd by our Saviour: The latter proceeds from God, whom we are bound to obey; but the former have the Devil, the Grand deceiver, for their Author, who makes uſe of the ſame Artifice as in the beginning, by working upon the Minds, and deluding the Weaker Sect, that they might inſinuate and draw into his Snares, others not well ſettled in Religion. For this Subtil Tempter of Mankind knows how and where to lay his baits, of what Metal we are made, and who are moſt likely to promote his Empire, being well acquainted with our Inclination and Diſpoſitions; but the contents of Mr. *Stennet*'s whole Book may be reduced to theſe *Six Heads. Firſt*, That there is no Divine Inſtitution for the Baptiſm of Infants. His meaning is, That Infants belong not to the Divine Inſtitution of Baptiſm. But I have proved the contrary, by the Command and Invitation of Chriſt, to *ſuffer little Children to come to him, &c.* and by the reaſon that he gives, becauſe his Kingdom, or his Church, where he reigns, belongs to them, into which they cannot be

be enter'd but by Baptiſm. And 'tis obſervable, how gracious God is to Children under the Goſpel, more than before, and under the Law; in that then none but Male Children were by Circumciſion to be introduc'd into Covenant with him, and upon their account and ſubmiſſion to this Ordinance, God promiſed to be the God of the Seed of *Abraham* without exception; the other Sex indeed were Proſelyted by Baptiſm; but under the Goſpel both Sexes are ordered to be initiated into Covenant with him, for our Saviour makes no diſtinction, but appoints ſucking Babes of either Sex to be brought to him, and inroll'd into his Church by Baptiſm. I appeal to the judicious Reader whether I have not ſufficiently vindicated this Doctrine of our Church, by divers Texts and Arguments out of the Word of God, and the univerſal conſent and practice of the firſt and preſent Ages; That Children of Believing Parents are to be Baptized by Chriſt's expreſs Command? Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s frequent ſuppoſitions in this are falſe and erroneous.

Secondly, He affirms, that Infants are no Diſciples, and cannot be ſo nominated till they are capable of inſtitution, or till they have been taught. This likewiſe I have proved to be falſe, if God's Holy Word be true, *Acts* 15. 10. where Infants at Three Days Old are nam'd Diſciples, as I have made it appear. Mr. *Stennet* oppoſes this Truth

Truth with Six Reaſons, That none can be made Diſciples without being firſt taught. But as in our Schools, ſome may be enter'd Diſciples and Scholars, when they are deſign'd to be taught by a Maſter, and from that time they are reckon'd as his Scholars; ſo Infants may be Chriſt's Diſciples, from their firſt admiſſion into his Church by Baptiſm. For his five other Reaſons, they are very weak: What belongs to the Adult in Holy Scripture, he applies to the caſe of Infants, who were never treated alike under the Law with Perſons of years and diſcretion, nor the ſame acts required from them as from the others, for the obtaining Church and Covenant Privileges: Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s Arguments and Allegations are frivolous and vain.

Thirdly, He would have Dipping to be the only and proper mode of Baptiſm; for he declares, that the original word Baptize, ſignifies only to dip or plunge, and not to ſprinkle; but this aſſertion I have prov'd to be falſe, both by the Word of God and *Greek* Authors, where βαπτίζειν is often uſed for ſprinkling, and cannot be ſometimes underſtood for dipping, immerſion or plunging.

Fourthly, That it was our Saviour's Inſtitution, confirm'd by his own practice, and that of St. *John*, of the Holy Apoſtles and of the primitive Ages, to Baptize always by Immerſion. But this we deny, and cannot be

be proved from the Word of God nor ancient Authors. In all the *Bible* I can find but one Text where Interpreters render the word Baptize by dipping, and in that I have taken notice, that the Spirit of God in the former Verſes, calls it Three times waſhing, 2 *Kings* 5. Mr. *Stennet* cannot prove that Chriſt inſtituted the Sacrament of Baptiſm to be adminiſtred by Dipping, unleſs the word Baptize did always ſignify Immerſion, which it does not, whatever his *Scapula's* and Lexicons (upon which his faith and perſwaſion wholly depends) ſays to the contrary, as I have made it appear; and demonſtrated that this word βαπτίζειν is frequently employ'd by the Evangeliſts for ſprinkling and waſhing, where 'tis unreaſonable to imagine any dipping, and that St. *Paul* names the Sprinklings of the Levetical Law, *Baptiſms*, *Heb.* 9. 10. Therefore his aſſertion is falſe, and of a dangerous conſequence, tending to the ſubverſion of all Chriſtianity amongſt us, and all Proteſtant Nations.

Fifthly, That ſprinkling or pouring of Water upon the Face is no Baptiſm, and that this Sacrament cannot be duly adminiſtred without dipping or a total immerſion of the whole Body in Water, are pernicious Errors, becoming the Charity of that Sect that pleads ſo much for the practice of that Vertue from others, in relation to themſelves; yet by their Doctrine are ſo uncharitable

uncharitable, that they will have none to be Chriſtians, or in a way to Salvation, beſides themſelves. Will Mr. *Stennet* impoſe upon us his falſe Conjectures and Suppoſitions, and miſtaken Interpritations, as undeniable proofs for Dipping and Immerſion? I muſt here retort upon him his own ſaying, p. 30. with a little Alteration: So weighty a matter as a due Adminiſtration of an Ordinance of Chriſt, ought to be better founded, than on a meer Conjecture of the Prejudiced *Anabaptiſts*; and the controlling of the Churches of Chriſt, Govern'd by the Spirit of God, in a matter of that concern, ought to be warranted by undeniable evidences from his Bleſſed Word; and a plain proof in the Holy Scripture, for Dipping and Immerſion of the whole Body over Head and Ears in Water, may be reaſonably demanded of thoſe, who plead for the practice of it; and a clear precedent for it, is the leaſt thing that can be required in this caſe.

Sixthly, That in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, Children were not admitted to Baptiſm; and that the Baptiſm of Infants began in the Third Century, is falſe, as we have already prov'd from the ancient Records. But is it not ſtrange, that after the peacable poſſeſſion of a Right and Title during above Fifteen Hundred years, according to our computation, and according to theirs Thirteen Hundred, without any

any controul, but from avowed Hereticks, a new Sect ſhould ariſe, and diſpute our Children out of that privilege, they have enjoyed ſo long. If an Heir to an Eſtate in Land had been diſpoſſeſſed of his freehold, deſcended to him from his forefathers thro' ſo many Ages, he wou'd think himſelf very much wrong'd, and upon ſuch ſlender, weak and unſufficient evidences, as our Adverſaries produce againſt our belief and practice. It was a Cuſtom amongſt the *Spartans*, and a Law, that none ſhould offer to aboliſh or plead for the altering any common practice or ordinance, but ſhould come with an Halter about his Neck, that if his motion in the aſſembly had been unjuſt and unreaſonable, he might be immediately Hang'd, to vindicate the Equity of that Law, by the Puniſhment of the Oppoſer. If ſuch a Practice had been amongſt us in theſe latter days of Error and Schiſm, we ſhould not have now ſo much cauſe as we have to lament at the unjuſt and damnable Innovations amongſt our People, in relation to Religion; and Diviſion would not have been ſo much countenanced as it is, to the deſtruction of ſo many Souls, and the contempt of Piety and the Worſhip of God.

The Reaſonings and Arguments, and drolling of Mr. *Stennet*, in his Anſwer to Mr. *Ruſſen*, are grounded and depend upon the forenamed falſe ſuppoſitions, which he often

often repeats and delivers for undeniable Truths, and with which he inſults and triumphs over his Adverſary. Now I am concern'd to reply to his evaſions, by which he would perſwade us, that the promiſe mention'd by St. *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 39. to the *Jews*, can give no countenance to Infant Baptiſm. He ſays, *I know not how the Citation of this Text can anſwer his end, unleſs he can prove this to be a promiſe of Baptiſm, or at leaſt of ſomewhat that gives an immediate right to it.* Mr. *Stennet* miſtakes St. *Peter* and the Text. 'Tis no promiſe to Baptiſm, but the promiſe of the remiſſion of Sins, conſequential to Baptiſm; a promiſe as ancient as *Abraham*, *I will be thy God, and of thy Seed after thee*; which promiſe concludes God's favour and the remiſſion of Sin, which was obtainable in Baptiſm, by what St. *Peter* told his Countrymen; That this promiſe is of the Holy Spirit mention'd in *Joel*, on the Miraculous effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt and of Tongues, unreaſonable to think; for Children are not capable of ſuch ſupernatural Gifts. But that the promiſe is of the Holy Spirit, I confeſs; for no Benefits nor Bleſſings can be expected in Baptiſm, but from the mercy and efficacy of God's Holy Spirit, which ſuppoſes our obedience and preſentation of Children. That the promiſe is annex'd to Repentance and Baptiſm in relation to the Adult *Jews*, is not queſtion'd, becauſe

becauſe they were concerned in the Crucifying of Chriſt, and without Repentance, 'twas unreaſonable to Baptize them in his Bleſſed Name; nor could they expect the Remiſſion of their Sins without it. But from their innocent Children, who had not been ſtained with that Sacred Blood, there was no juſt cauſe to require Repentance, but only that they ſhould be Baptized, to be enter'd into the ſame Covenant of Grace with their Parents, for the procuring to them the benefits there offer'd. That Children and Infants are here to be underſtood, is plain, for there is no exception of any. And if Mr. *Stennet* will have the word Children to be taken for Poſterity, I hope that word comprehends their Children that were then born, as well as thoſe that were not. Therefore here he ſeems to contradict himſelf twice, in allowing the promiſe to be made to their Poſterity, but not to their Children, tho' that word ſignifies all their Children, born and unborn, and the Succeeding Generations. And 'tis very unreaſonable to think, that the promiſe of Remiſſion of Sins, or any other promiſe, ſhould belong to their Poſterity, and that their Children then in being ſhould have no right to it; as if God were more gracious and favourable to thoſe that were not, than to thoſe that were in being. So when I compare his firſt evaſion, where he ſaith, *This promiſe is of the Holy Spirit ſpoken of,* v. 33. *with*

his

his 4th, where he acknowledges this Promiſe to be annex'd to Repentance and Baptiſm, which was of the Remiſſion of Sins. I meet with another contradiction that this Judicious and Learned Man is guilty of; and he inſiſts upon this latter Expoſition, and ſtrains his Wit and Reaſon, to ſhew how uncapable Infants are of this promiſe, becauſe they are not able to perform the condition of that promiſe; I have already anſwered to this frivolous objection in divers places: They perform the Conditions by their Sureties, who promiſe for them; which promiſe when they come to Age, themſelves are bound to perform. Again, 'tis unreaſonable to ſuppoſe Repentance needful in Infants, who have no other guilt but of original Sin. Neither is in them any thing contrary to that Qualification and Diſpoſition requeſite in the Adult, to intitle them to Baptiſm. Therefore this reaſoning of Mr. *Stennet*'s is very weak and improper. *Why may not the Adult alſo expect for themſelves the accompliſhment of the ſame promiſe, without fulfilling the condition of it?* I appeal to his own Judgment whether his Queſtion be rational; 'tis as if he ſhould ſay, Why may not a *Jew*, a *Turk*, or other *Infidel*, while he Blaſphemes Chriſt, Adores his *Mahomet* for his Prophet, Worſhips his falſe Gods, and all that deny Chriſt, be admitted into his Church by Baptiſm, while they continue in their Infidelity, as well as the

Children of Believing Parents, who are reſolv'd to train them up in his Holy Profeſſion? Is this a Reaſoning becoming ſo Sublime an Underſtanding as that of Mr. *Stennet?* And tho' Promiſes and Commands were given to the Children of *Iſrael*, which were not to be performed by them in the State of Infancy, What is that to our purpoſe here? Do ſuch Promiſes and Commands diſannul God's promiſe of being the God of our Children, of granting to them the Pardon of their Sins, and of Divine Favour and Mercy ſo young? All which is to be obtain'd and promiſed to them in this Ordinance of Baptiſm.

That the Faith and Profeſſion of Chriſtianity of Parents and other Friends, entitles their Infants to Baptiſm, I have already proved by St. *Paul*'s ſtiling them Holy. Mr. *Stennet* need not call for a proof of this Truth, if he wou'd mind how the Faith of a certain Father, who had but a ſmall meaſure of it, clouded by unbelief, which occaſion'd this complaint, *Lord I believe, help thou my unbelief*, obtain'd for his Son a perfect Cure, in a Miraculous manner by the Mercy and Power of Chriſt. And why may not the Faith of Parents be as beneficial to them, and powerful with our good God, to procure to them Spiritual Mercies, as it was to draw upon this Child a Temporal One, when they dedicate them to his Honour and Service in Baptiſm

an

and enter them thereby into his Holy Profeſſion and Covenant? If Mr. *Stennet* enquires what Covenant I mean, 'tis the Covenant of Grace, or of the Goſpel, into which Men and Children are viſibly admitted by Baptiſm. Belief is a Qualification needful in Men, for their admittance to that Ordinance; but Infants are to be receiv'd into it, tho' they cannot actually believe, through the Mercy of God, that Indulges their weakneſs and incapacities, and without any mention of Faith or Repentance from them promiſes in this Covenant, *To be merciful to their Unrighteouſneſs, and their Sins and Iniquities will I Remember no more*, Heb. 8. 12.

Mr. *Stennet* queſtions next, What right the Infants of vicious Parents, who are no better than *Pagans*, *Jews*, and *Mahometans*, have to Baptiſm? I anſwer, the ſame right they have to Baptiſm as the Infants of debauch'd *Jews*, of Publicans and Sinners had to Circumciſion. Tho' their Parents are vicious, the Children are like to be brought up in the knowledge of Chriſtianity, and may perhaps take another Courſe of Living. The ſinful lives or practical unbelief of their Parents ought not to prejudice their right and claim to Baptiſm and the Covenant, being born of outward Profeſſors, who are within the Pale of the Church; and there is no manner of Compariſon between them and the Children of Infidels, who are to be

tutored in their enmity toChriſt and his Profeſſion. Our Children have therefore a birth-right to be enter'd into Covenant with God, and to be admitted to the outward Seal of it,which is Baptiſm. But as to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they are not qualified for that until they come to years of Diſcretion, for the reaſons I have already mention'd. As to the following Paragraphs, that deny Aſperſion to be a lawful mode of Baptiſm, and Infants to be no proper Subjects of it, I have ſufficiently proved the contrary already. And for Mr. *Ruſſen*'s indelible Character imprinted at Baptiſm, I cannot be of his judgment; and for other matters, till the end of Mr. *Stennet*'s Second Chapter, I have either anſwered them, or they deſerve not any notice to be taken of them, in relation to the cauſe that I maintain.

In his Third Chapter, which firſt treats of the names given to this Sect by Mr. *Ruſſen* and others, Mr. *Stennet* eſteems the Name of *Anabaptiſts* to be wrongfully beſtowed upon them; for he looks upon the Baptiſm of our Church to be null and void, and terms it an Humane Ceremony of giving a Name, p. 51. and judges Chriſtning to be a Profanation of the Sacred Name of Chriſt; but how unjuſtly and wrongfully he abuſes our Church and Miniſtry, and this Ordinance of Chriſt adminiſtred by us his Lawful Miniſters and Stewards, let the

the Reader judge from the Premiſes. Amongſt the divers Sects mention'd by Mr. *Ruſſen*, are the *Hemerobaptiſts*, which were a Sect of the *Jews*, before the coming of Chriſt, imitated by the late Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*, as ſome affirm, in their daily Waſhings or Dipping themſelves. But how this and other Names given to other Heretical Sects of Antiquity, who never denied Baptiſm to Infants, can prove this preſent Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*, to be of an older Date than 1521 or 1522, I underſtand not.

Therefore the ancient *Apoſtolici*, *Cathari*, *Adamites*, *Silentes*, *Enthuſiaſts*, &c. who were not unknown to St. *Auguſtine*, were no *Anabaptiſts*, or of the ſame Perſwaſion in this Caſe with thoſe, whom Mr. *Ruſſen* calls by thoſe Names from *Alſtedius*'s *Ind. Theol. Polem.* for that Orthodox Father affirms, *that he never knew, nor heard of any Sect, that were ſo impious as to deny Baptiſm to Infants.* Therefore Mr. *Ruſſen* is not miſtaken when he affirms, *That Infant Baptiſm has been the conſtant Opinion and Practice of the Univerſal Church, both Primitive and Modern*, and only denied by the *Antipædobaptiſts* of theſe Two laſt Centuries, contrary to the Example, Faith, and Practice of the Univerſal or Catholick Church. What Proofs we have from Holy Scripture for Infant Baptiſm, I have already ſet down, and what Evidences we have from human Teſtimonies, to witneſs this to have been

the Doctrine and Practice of the firſt Ages, next to the Apoſtles, let *Origen*, *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr* and others, formerly mention'd, declare. Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s ſaying, *That Infant Baptiſm began to creep into the Church in* Tertullian's *Time*, is not true; for it was the conſtant Practice of Chriſtians before, as we have made it appear. And is it probable, if it had then begun, that *Tertullian*, who diſſwades from it, would not have declar'd it to be an Innovation in the Church, to ſtrengthen his Opinion, and to diſcourage the conſtant Uſage. *Cyprian*'s Teſtimony, which is undeniable for Infant Baptiſm, he deſpiſes, becauſe of the weak Arguments he uſes to perſwade it to *Fidus* before Eight Days old; but *Cyprian*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* and the reſt, writ according to the Humour and Capacity of their Age, and neither of them ſeem to be great Logicians. Therefore to cavil at the weakneſs of *Cyprian*'s reaſoning, is impertinent to our purpoſe, and cannot diſprove his Evidence for Infant-Baptiſm, to have been then the undoubted and unqueſtionable Practice of the Churches of God. He muſt needs be at that Time about Fifty Years old; And is it likely, that about one Hundred Years after the deceaſe of St. *John*, the laſt ſurviving Apoſtle of Chriſt, *Cyprian* ſhould be ignorant of the Apoſtolick Doctrines and Practices in this Caſe?

For

For *Rigaltius*'s Annotations upon St. *Cyprian*, I have this to ſay, That he is a very bad Commentator, to act the Part of a Cenſurer, inſtead of explaining the Author's meaning. But as Mr. *St.* ſpeaks of Martyrs and Confeſſors, *Page* 123. *He is no Rule to us, unleſs we could be ſure he were infallible; we ſhall not be ſecure in following his Judgment, any further than he follows Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And as there are divers Miſtakes of his, in relation to the Word of God in that Quotation, we have reaſon to reject him as erroneous. Mr. *St.* would perſwade the World, That this Cuſtom firſt took its Riſe from a Miſ-interpretation of thoſe Words of our Saviour, *Except a Man be born of Water, &c. John* 3. 5. *From whence ſome concluded Salvation not attainable without Baptiſm*, &c. Does Mr. *Stennet* imagine that his vain and groundleſs Fancies will paſs for current Truths? He calls our, and the Univerſal Churches Expoſition of this Text, a Miſ-interpretation; but I have proved it to be Orthodox, and agreeable with *Chriſt*'s purpoſe, in his Anſwer to *Nicodemus*, in my reply to Mr. *Charnock*'s ſimple Expoſition of the Words, which I find Mr. *St.* follows. He ſeems to deny, to be born of Water to ſignify external Waſhing, and yet confirms it by that Text he brings, *Tit.* 3. 5. What falſe Gloſſes and Interpretations do our Adverſaries give to God's Holy Word, to eſtabliſh their abominable Errors? Here are

Two Paſſages that expreſly declare the neceſſity of Infant-Baptiſm in order to Salvation, in the ordinary Method and Courſe of Divine Grace; that of St. *John*, *Except a Perſon be born of Water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Chriſt* requires Two things from *Nicodemus*, to enter into God's Kingdom, but Mr. *St.* ſays there is but One. No Wonder if he contradicts us ſinful Men, ſince he dares contradict our infallible Redeemer, in ſo plain and intelligible a Text; but ſays he, *Water and the Spirit, is the Water of the Spirit, or Spiritual Water.* Mr. *St.* muſt be gifted with that warm Brain he mentions, *p.* 70. to argue as he does. If Men will give themſelves the Liberty, thus to pervert and abuſe the Scripture, there is no Text, never ſo clear, but may be thus abuſed and darken'd to the Underſtandings of the Hearers. That our Saviour underſtands the Baptiſm of Water, the Baptiſm of *John*; without which, this *Phariſee* could not enter, nor be received into the Kingdom of the Meſſiah; and the Birth of the Spirit, the inward Operation of the Holy Ghoſt in the Soul, is a certain Truth; for both Conditions being neceſſarily required in the Subjects of that Kingdom, an outward Profeſſion, or a Submiſſion to the Ordinances of God, and an inward Sanctification of the Mind, to render them capable of it, or well qualified for it: Therefore St. *Peter* exhorts the firſt converted

Jews

Jews to be baptized; and after *Cornelius* and his Company had received the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, yet Baptiſm of Water was thought required, to obſerve the Orders of that Kingdom. If Chriſt's Meaning had been altogether Spiritual, Why does Chriſt tell him, that he ſpoke to him of earthly things? *v.* 12. What other earthly thing was there in this Diſcourſe of our Saviour, beſides to be Born, or Regenerated of Water? In all the Subjects of his Kingdom, does not he require an outward Profeſſion, as well as an inward Qualification? And is not the firſt Step into it Baptiſm? Mr. *St.* by his falſe Gloſs declares the Baptiſm of Water to be needleſs in the Church; which is the *Quakers* Opinion: For if only a Spiritual Birth was neceſſary, to enter into Chriſt's Kingdom, What need of the Ordinance of Baptiſm? Here he contradicts the Confeſſion of his Faith, and divers Paſſages of his Book, where he declares for the Uſefulneſs of outward Baptiſm, by ſuppoſing but one thing needful to enter into Chriſt's Kingdom, and really to belong to it. Again, Chriſt offers to *Nicodemus* a Means to enter into his Kingdom, which by his coming to him privately in the Night, he ſeems to decline; not to be aſham'd of Chriſt's Perſon and Profeſſion, but publickly to own it, by a Compliance with the Ordinances of God. And the Text that Mr. *St.* cites, *Tit.* 3. 5. plainly contradicts the purpoſe

for which he quotes it. St. *Paul* tells us how God ſaveth us, *not by Works of Righteouſneſs, which we have done; but according to his Mercy, he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* What means he by the waſhing of Regeneration, but Chriſt's Birth, or to be born of Water, or Baptiſm of Water, the outward means appointed for us to practiſe, and ſubmit to, and not the inward Regeneration, which is expreſſed in the next Words, by the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt. How many abſurd Tautologies, and inſignificant Repetitions, would our Adverſaries fix upon our Saviour *Chriſt* and St. *Paul*, to ſtrengthen their Perſwaſion? For 'tis certain, that the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt is the internal Waſhing of Regeneration that Mr. *Stennet* mentions, the inward Renovation and Sanctification of the Mind aſcribed to, and effected in us, by the ſole Operation of the Spirit of God, who purifies our Hearts by Faith, *Acts* 15. 9. St. *Peter* ſpeaks there of the *Gentiles*, who had the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt granted to them, before they were born of Water; yet this Birth, or Waſhing of Regeneration, was judg'd needful, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we?* And is not this Interpretation agreeable with St. *Paul*'s Saying, *Eph.* 5. *That Chriſt ſanctifies and cleanſeth his Church by the Waſhing of Water, and the Word?*

Where

Where the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the outward Methods uſed for that purpoſe.

Now according to the fore-nam'd Text of the Apoſtle, *Tit.* 3. 5. Chriſt ſaving us by the Waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, without any previous Acts or Merits of ours, Is it not neceſſary that all Perſons young and old, ſhould be Partakers, and concern'd in this Waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, to attain to Salvation? The Firſt is in our Power, the Second depends upon the Will and Grace of the Spirit of God. But we have reaſon to be fully perſwaded, that if Adult Perſons by theſe Means are ſaved, God will much rather grant his Salvation to Believers Children, who having no other Sins but Original Guilt and Pollution, they may be more readily remedied and obliterated by the ſame outward and inward Means, when they are preſented to him in this Ordinance of Regeneration. And if we neglect what is left to us, and expected from our Obedience to perform, I know not of any other Expedient propoſed by Chriſt to the Human Race, to obtain a Title to his Redemption, and the Salvation of Souls. Does not this Text plainly declare for the Neceſſity to be born of Water, as well as of the Spirit, to enter into the Kingdom of God, ſince Chriſt ſaves none by any other revealed Method as we underſtand? And what God ſaid unto

unto *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 14. in relation to Children and his Covenant, is applicable to our Children under the Goſpel Covenant, in reference to Baptiſm: *The uncircumciſed Man Child, whoſe Fleſh of his Fore-skin is not Circumciſed, that Soul ſhall be cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.* Where we may obſerve that the Puniſhment for ſuch a Neglect, or Omiſſion of God's Ordinance, falls upon the Child, tho' the Parents alone were guilty; and if he was to be cut off from God's People on Earth, excommunicated out of the Church, What hopes of ſuch a Child dying uncircumciſed, was there of Salvation, ſince God inflicts the Puniſhment on the Child in this Life, and charges the Child with the Crime of having broken his Covenant? This Caſe in reſpect of Baptiſm is ours; the Parents neglect or contempt of that Ordinance, may prejudice and hinder their Childrens Salvation, ſince none are ſaved without the Waſhing of Regeneration, and the Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, or by the Birth of Water and the Spirit, in the ordinary Way, that Chriſt hath preſcribed. Therefore *Ferus* on *Matth.* 19. tells us, *Juſte & vere ex Spiritu Chriſti Eccleſia etiam Pueros baptizat. Non igitur Chriſtianum, ſed plane Herodianum, vel ſi mavis Egyptiacum eſt Parvulos Populi necare:* The Church alſo directed by the Spirit of Chriſt, juſtly and truly baptizeth Infants. Therefore 'tis not a

Practice

Practice becoming Chriſtians, but more like to that of *Herod*, or rather like that of the *Egyptians*, to deſtroy the Children of the People. He means, by depriving them of Baptiſm, the Method of Salvation, appointed by God in his Church for that purpoſe.

Now to confirm his falſe Expoſition, Mr. *Stennet* perverts another Text of Scripture, *That there is the ſame Reaſon to interpret Water and the Spirit, the Water of the Spirit or Spiritual Water in this Paſſage, as to underſtand Spirit and Fire of* Matth. 3. 11. *to ſignify the Fire of the Spirit, or Spiritual Fire, in the Words of* John *the Baptiſt*, when he ſays of Chriſt, *He ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire.* How ſtrangely do Men of corrupt Minds and Principles abuſe the true ſenſe of the Word of God? The Spirit and the Fire are Two different things underſtood by the *Baptiſt* and the *Evangeliſt*, as the Context plainly proves; for *John* here tells the *Jews*, That he could only adminiſter to them the Baptiſm of Water, but there was one coming after him with far greater Power, Authority, and Efficacy, who ſhould baptize them with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire. Theſe Two Operations, or Effects of our Saviour's Power, was in relation to the Two ſorts of Perſons who came to *John*'s Baptiſm, the ſincere Profeſſors, and the Hypocrites, whom Chriſt knew better than *John* how to diſtinguiſh: The ſincere Profeſſors he was to Baptize

Baptize with the Holy Choſt, to ſanctify and cleanſe them from all Spiritual Pollution; but the Hypocrites he was to Baptize with Fire. Is not this the Expoſition that the Baptiſt gives to his own Words in the next Verſe? *Whoſe Fan is in his Hand, and he will throughly purge his Flour, and gather his Wheat into the Garner; but he will burn up the Chaff with unquenchable Fire.* I would ask Mr. *Stennet*, or thoſe who give that falſe Gloſs to the *Baptiſt*'s firſt Words, Whether all that were to come to Chriſt's Baptiſm were to be Baptized with the ſame Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire? Or of Sanctification, as he underſtands the Words? If not, then here are Two Demonſtrations of our Saviour's Power, able to diſcriminate between God's Elect, and the Ungodly: The one was to be cleanſed by the Holy Ghoſt, and the other condemned to everlaſting Flames. This is ſo natural an Interpretation of this Paſſage, that 'tis a Wonder how Men, who profeſs the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, ſhould miſtake and err herein. And whereas Mr. *St.* ſaith, *Fire and Water are frequently uſed in Holy Scripture, to ſignify the ſanctifying Operation of the Holy Spirit, in alluſion to the Uſe of theſe Elements for Purification*, &c. this is not altogether true. There may be ſome Alluſions to the purifying Virtue of Water applied to the Holy Ghoſt, but always with an Epithet, to ſignify its Spiritual Meaning, as the Living Water offer'd by Chriſt to the

Samaritan

Samaritan Woman; but Water alone, is never underſtood for any ſuch purifying Operation, as Mr. *St.* affirms. And for Fire, 'tis never taken in a Spiritual Senſe in the *Bible*, but either for the Puniſhment of the Wicked, and to expreſs the Fierceneſs of God's Wrath kindled againſt them, or the Chaſtiſements and Afflictions of his People, who are to be as Gold refin'd and tried in the Fire. Therefore to tell us that Fire alone is frequently uſed in Holy Scripture, to ſignify the ſanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit, is not true, neither can one Text be produced to prove it. I am ſorry that ſo Ingenious and Learned a Perſon as Mr. *Stennet*, is guilty of ſo many Miſ-applications of the Holy Scripture, in one ſingle Paragraph. Where he proceeds to tell us, *'Tis certain this groundleſs Opinion, That none could enter into the Kingdom of Heaven without Baptiſm, made Infant-Baptiſm prevail in the World.* How dares Mr. *St.* call Chriſt's Declaration to *Nicodemus*, confirm'd by his uſual Aſſeveration, *Verily, Verily*, a groundleſs Opinion? Chriſt ſpeaks of the common Method appointed in his Church, to enter into his Kingdom: Therefore Parents had, and have now reaſon to believe Baptiſm abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, according to Chriſt's Order and Inſtitution, with which we are to comply. He mentions next *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, and St. *Auguſtin*, who from this Text of St. *John* concluded the Neceſſity of Baptiſm,

Baptiſm to obtain Salvation. But he tells us, *That Proteſtants have juſtly abandon'd that Principle, upon which the* Romiſh *Church ſtill builds their Infant-Baptiſm.* But methinks Mr. *St.* a Man of his Reading, ſhould be better acquainted with the Belief and Doctrines of *Proteſtants* and *Romaniſts*, than to tell us ſuch a Tale. It might have been excuſable in my School-Maſter of *Wapping*, who knows no difference between Teaching and Learning, between a Schollar and his Maſter; but in Mr. *Stennet*, a Judicious and Learned Man, the Corypheus and Champion of his Sect, ſhould have underſtood, that the *Romaniſts* build their Infant-Baptiſm, not upon the Word of God, but upon the Tradition of their Church, out of which their Belief is, That none can be ſaved. 'Tis upon this Principle, that they build the Neceſſity of their Infant-Baptiſm. This is intimated by the ſaying of the Learned *Whitaker* againſt *Stapleton*, *De Author. S. S. lib.* 1. *cap.* 9. *We receive not Baptiſm from the Authority of the Church, the Scripture is abundantly ſufficient*, &c. Now all Proteſtants have not abandon'd this Principle, the neceſſity of Baptiſm in order to Salvation, nor this Interpretation of that Text of St. *John* 3. 5. as Mr. *Stennet* would perſwade; for our Rubrick, in the Office of Baptiſm, in the Beginning, repeats the Words of Chriſt, to juſtify the Practice of our Church, and moſt of our Divines interpret them as we

do,

do, to impoſe upon us a neceſſary Submiſſion to the Ordinances of God; but as God is a free Agent, he may ſave without the outward means; but we have no Warrant out of his Holy Word certainly to inform us, what he can, will, or may do in this Caſe. Neither are we to depend upon his ſecret Will, but upon his revealed, unto which we are bound to conform. Now his revealed Will commands us, *To ſuffer little Children to come unto him, and not to forbid them.* And again it tells us, *Except a Perſon be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Can we have a more ſolid Foundation for our *Infant-Baptiſm* and Cuſtom, than the Command and Words of Chriſt, who not only enjoins the Practice, but diſcovers the neceſſity of our Compliance with his Baptiſmal Inſtitution, for our entrance into the Kingdom of God? Therefore ſince we have ſuch plain and intelligible Texts for Infant-Baptiſm, we cannot be miſtaken.

Mr. *Stennet* continues to argue, from his falſe Suppoſition, *Since this Foundation or Text of Scripture, is by theſe allowed to be inſufficient to bear the weight of Infant-Baptiſm, it might be worth a further Enquiry, whether this Practice is founded on any ſolid Foundation at all.* I fancy he underſtands ſome of our Proteſtant *Diſſenters*, as Mr. *Charnock* and others; but I am perſwaded moſt of the foreign Divines have not abandon'd this Principle, witneſs the *Theſ. Salmur. Zanchius*, &c. But can

Mr. *Stennet*

Mr. *Stennet* require a more ſolid Foundation than God's bleſſed Word, from whence we have clearly prov'd our Infant-Baptiſm, as he may ſee if he be not wilfully blind; and we have confirm'd it by the Practices and Judgments of Chriſtians in all Ages next to the Apoſtles, and by all the Churches of Chriſt in this preſent Age, there is not one but baptizes Infants.

He tells us next of various Superſtitions that were invented, when Baptiſm began to be adminiſtred to Infants. Mr. *Stennet* perſiſts in his Miſtakes; for Baptiſm of Infants is of a Divine Inſtitution, as I have made it appear. And for the Sign of the Croſs, which I am oblig'd to vindicate, 'tis very ancient, and ſo much eſteem'd by the firſt Chriſtian Emperor, that he bore it in his Victorious Banners. And 'tis obſerv'd by *Euſebius*, that thoſe who ſtood under, or carried in Battle the Enſign of the Croſs, were never wounded. And at the Baptiſm of *Conſtantine*, after he was regenerated by the New Birth of Baptiſm, he was ſigned with the Sign of the Croſs, *&c.* in *Vita Conſt. Lib.* 4. *cap.* 62. 'Tis generally believed, that this Sign was uſed in the Apoſtles Days, and ever ſince by the Primitive Chriſtians, as a publick and open Confeſſion of Chriſt and his Profeſſion, and a Sign of their braving the Enemies reproaches upon that account, and that they were not aſham'd of the ignominy

niny of his Croſs, but gloried in it before heir Enemies.

Mr. *Stennet* ſaith well, That the Uſe of ureties, as he names *God-fathers* and *God-nothers*, appear to be of no leſs ancient Date, than the Baptiſm of Infants, ſince we ind it in the *Jewiſh* Church long before the acrament of Baptiſm, *Iſaiah* 8. 2. They are amed there *Witneſſes*. And when *John the Baptiſt* was Circumciſed, others beſides his Parents preſented him to that Ordinance, nd were to give him a Name. And if we may believe the *Jews* Records and Rabbies, hoſe Witneſſes perform'd the ſame Office in Circumciſion, as our Sureties do for our Children at Baptiſm. But I have already uſtified in my firſt *Antidote* this ancient and eligious Cuſtom, againſt the vain and fri-olous Exceptions of Diſſenting Adverſaries. Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s Conceptions of the Reaſons, how it came to be introduc'd into the Chriſtian Church, and that it hath no Foundation in the Word of God, are vain, groundleſs and imaginary. And all the Concluſions and Arguments, that he draws from his falſe Suppoſitions, for which he hath no Evidence from any ancient Author, to diſprove the Divine Inſtitution, and reaſon-ableneſs of Infant-Baptiſm, are likewiſe er-roneous and falſe. To read Mr. *Stennet*'s poſitive Aſſertions, That Infant-Baptiſm with other Rites and Ceremonies, began in the Church in the Days of *Tertullian*, which was about

about the Year of our Lord 202, one would think, that he was in being, and preſent at theſe Innovations; But what Authority has he for ſuch Untruths that he vouches, and offers to impoſe upon the credulous World? If the Rites of Infant-Baptiſm, and Sureties, had then firſt begun to be received, 'tis ſtrange that no Author, then nor ſince, would be ſo juſt and kind to future Ages, to give an Account of theſe Novelties: 'Tis ſtrange that all Churches, both of the *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, ſhould agree together at the ſame Time, to admit theſe Innovations: 'Tis likewiſe very ſtrange, if not incredible, that none of the Religious Biſhops, and Orthodox and Holy Martyrs, ſhould not offer to oppoſe ſuch irregular Practices, ſo contrary, as Mr. *Stennet* would perſwade us, to the Primitive Examples of the Apoſtles, of whom ſome were almoſt their immediate Succeſſors, and therefore could not be ignorant of their Doctrines and Actions. Does *Tertullian* bring any other Reaſons againſt Infant-Baptiſm, but his own Fancy, that they make too much haſte? Why does not he plead Antiquity, and the Apoſtolick Judgment and Practices, to diſſwade the Men of his Days from Infant-Baptiſm, if it was then firſt received into the Church. Repentance and Faith are required in Adult Perſons, according to the Direction of the Church of *England*: But Mr. *Stennet* and our Adverſaries, won't repeat the Anſwer to the next Queſtion, *Why*

are

are Infants Baptiz'd, when by reaſon of their Tender Age they cannot perform them? They promiſe them both by their Sureties, which promiſe when they come to Age, themſelves are bound to perform. If they bring the Authority of the Church of *England* for one perſwaſion, why not for another? I have already diſcours'd about *Sureties* in my firſt *Antidote*, and ſhewn the Antiquity of that uſage in the Church of *Rome*, mention'd before *Tertullian* in the days of *Hyginus*, about *A. D.* 141. His Order ſavours not of Novelty, but ſeems to aſſure us, That it was the ancient practice both to Baptize Infants, and to preſent them to the Font by thoſe Charitable Friends, whom *Platina* names, *Patrimus & Patrima*, and as *Faſcicul. Tempor.* calls them, *Patrinus & Patrina.*. *Egeſippus*, a Famous Writer, being at *Rome* in the days of *Anicetus* Biſhop of that City affirmeth, That *A. D.* 159, there was an Uniformity of Doctrine and Practice in the Churches, and that in *Rome* there was nothing elſe Preached but the Purity of the Chriſtian Faith, *Euſ.* 4 *l. c.* 21. It ſeems that theſe two Cuſtoms of the Baptiſm of Infants and Sureties, had been receiv'd and eſtabliſh'd in that Church ſome years before, if we may believe Authors; and if ſo, theſe Practices were agreeable to the Divine Law of our Lord by the Teſtimony of *Egeſippus*, for he ſaith, *The Lord himſelf Preached.*

I ſhall

I ſhall not inſiſt upon Mr. *Stennet*'s next Paragraph, where he tells us, *That it was the general, if not the univerſal Practice of all Chriſtian Churches for ſeveral Ages, to admit all who were Baptiz'd to partake of the Lord's Supper:* Adult Perſons I confeſs; but that Infants were generally and in all Churches admitted to that participation as he would inſinuate, I deny as an untruth. Some Superſtitious Perſons may have practiſed this cuſtom out of an high opinion of the Virtue of the Conſecrated Bread and Wine, to give it to Infants; but it was never an univerſal cuſtom in all Churches as Baptiſm of Infants and Sureties have been. Why we omit it in our Church, I have given ſufficient and ſatisfactory Reaſons. For the evidence that Mr. *Stennet* brings from *Suicerus* concerns us not. He charges next, the *Vaudois* and *Albigeois* with the denial of Baptiſm to Infants; and brings *Chaſſanion*, who ſpeaks not upon his own knowledge, but ſays, Some Writers have affirm'd, that the *Albigeois* approved not of the Baptiſm of Infants; others, that they entirely ſlighted this Holy Sacrament, as if it were of no uſe either to great or ſmall. Will Mr. *Stennet* crave kindred with ſuch Deſpiſers and Rejecters of Chriſt's Ordinance? He offers to prove it by *Bernard*'s Teſtimony, a Devout Man, but a Popiſh Abbot of *Clarenvaux:* That Party repreſented them to the World as black as

Slander

ſlander and Lying could paint them, to excuſe the Cruelties and Butcheries acted upon them. Now is it reaſonable that we ſhould give credit to *Petrus Cluniacenſis* a railing Abbot, and to the reſt of their ſworn Enemies, rather than to indifferent Perſons, who ſpeak of them without prejudice? *Hoveden, Rainerius, Jacob de Riberia in Collect. de urbe Tholeſſ. Balthazar Lydius Tom.* 2. p. 285. In a Confeſſion preſented to *Vladiſlaus* King of *Hungary*, Arch-biſhop *Uſher*, and *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards *Pope Pius* the IId in his Hiſtory of *Bohem.* c. 35. free them from this accuſation, which may have taken its Riſe, from their refuſing to have their Children Baptized by the Popiſh Prieſts. In *Paul Perrins*'s Hiſt. l. 1. p. 3. c. 3. We find their Confeſſion of Faith in theſe words; *Baptiſm is adminiſtred in a full Congregation of the Faithful to this end, that he that is receiv'd into the Church, ſhou'd be reputed by all for a Brother, and that all the Congregation might pray for him, that he may be a Chriſtian in Heart, as he is outwardly eſteem'd for One. And for this cauſe it is, that we preſent our Children in Baptiſm, which they ought to do to whom the Children are neareſt, as their Parents, and they to whom God hath given this Charity.* *Du Pleſſis Mornay* affirms, That neither they, nor *Henry*, nor *Peter Bruis* their Teachers, were Enemies of Infant Baptiſm, as our Adverſaries wou'd perſwade the World, from the

lying

lying Hiſtories of their Popiſh Butchers, the Monks and Fryars of thoſe days. The *Bohemians* were their Brethren, and by their Confeſſion of Faith we may judge whether the *Vaudois* were againſt Infants Baptiſm as Mr. *Stennet* wrongfully accuſes them. He may as well declare them to be Enemies of all Baptiſm, as ſome of the Papiſts have affirm'd, as *Mariana* a Jeſuit, from the Writings of *William Nangiacus*, and *Peter* a *Ciſtercian* Monk, in a Book dedicated to *Pope Innocent* III. Theſe are the words of *Mariana*, of the Opinions of the *Vaudois*: *That Prieſts have no Power to forgive Sins*; *That the Body of Chriſt is not in the Sacrament*; *That the Water of Baptiſm hath no power to cleanſe the Soul from Sin, &c.* Mr. *Stennet* quotes Dr. *Allix*'s Remarks on the Church of *Piedmont*; and concerning *Gundulphus* and his followers in *Italy*, *A. D.* 1025. That they denied Infant-Baptiſm; But Mr. *Stennet* ſuppreſſes the following account, where 'tis ſaid, that they denied the Sacrament of Baptiſm to the Adult, as well as to Infants. Theſe Men were of the perſwaſion of the *Manichees* and of the preſent *Quakers*, as *Ecbertus* informs us. And will our Anabaptiſts challenge them to be their Brethren who deny all Baptiſm? The Orthodox Perſwaſion of the ancient *Vaudois* in Relation to Infant Baptiſm, may appear from the former evidences, and from the Poſterity of the Remnant of thoſe perſecuted People, driven

driven up into the Barren Mountains of the *Alpes* for ſhelter. At the beginning of the Reformation they agreed and joyned with the Proteſtants in this and other Articles and Practices. Therefore Mr. *Stennet* Slanders thoſe worthy Confeſſors of the Orthodox Faith with the Popiſh Crue, by ſaying they approved not of Infant Baptiſm. What Mr. *Stennet* alledges out of *Vanſleb.* of the Church of *Alexandria*'s not Baptizing Infants in the firſt Ages, depends upon the hear-ſay of a *Dominican Fryar.* From what Author he had it, or from what Authority, is uncertain. 'Tis unreaſonable to give any Credit to him, or to *Ludovicus Vives, Annotator* upon St. *Auguſt.* He might have underſtood from that ancient Father, that no Sect or Church in the firſt Ages ever denied Baptiſm to Infants, if they own'd the Holy Scripture: But I would ask Mr. *Stennet*, while we have plain evidences from Antiquity, and the next Ages to the Apoſtles, of Infants being Baptized, as of *Origen* and others, and good Authors to prove that conſtant Practice; ſhall we believe *Vives, Suicerus, Curcellæus*, or any other, who living above a Thouſand years after, offer to impoſe ſuch an Untruth and Error upon the Chriſtian World, which we know to be ſo, and have proved it. When we ſee the Sun Shines, ſhall we believe a Thouſand Blind Perſons who affirm the contrary. What he quotes

next out of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Baſil*, *Jerom*, and Dr. *Barrow*, relates to Adult Perſons and not to Infants; and whereas he pretends to be tried by the Word of God, I could wiſh that he and his Party would hearken to Chriſt's Invitation of little Infants to come to his Baptiſmal Covenant, and examine with unprejudiced Minds the plain Proofs that I have brought, for the Baptizing of our Children, out of Scripture, and the general Approbation of this Religious Cuſtom in all Ages; he would read there the Condemnation of his Pernicious Errors and groſs miſtakes. Is it probable that a handful of Men, or a few, ſhould be able to diſcover and ſee more than the whole Chriſtian Church, while we have the ſame helps and aſſiſtances as they can pretend to, and altogether as much zeal and affection for Truth, as our Adverſaries can have? They pretend to appeal to the Holy Scripture, and profeſs to have no other Rule of their Faith and Worſhip; But was this Holy Scripture never underſtood by Chriſt's Churches and People, till *N. Storke*, *Th. Muncer*, *Knipperdoling*, *Servetus*, *John of Leyden*, the vileſt of Men, and our Mechanick Teachers, the Tinckers, Porters, Tallow-chandlers, Tin-men, Pewterers, Thatchers, Black-ſmiths, Butchers, Small-coal-men, and ſuch like Fellows as are Preachers amongſt the *Anabaptiſts* have reveal'd it to the World. Are we all in the dark?

dark? And muſt we be inſtructed of the true ſenſe of Holy Scripture by theſe Men, when ſome of 'em can ſcarce Write or Read? We are warned by St. *Peter*, That 'tis no new practice for ſuch as are *unlearned to wreſt the Scripture to their own Deſtruction*, 2 *Peter* 3. 16. They have not any Text of that bleſſed Word of God, to favour the denying of Baptiſm to Infants, or for to tie and confine us to the Mode of Dipping, as I have made it appear; therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s vaunting and boaſting of Holy Scripture and of Divine Revelation to be on their ſide, is vain, frivolous, groundleſs and falſe. All his other Paragraphs to the end of his Fourth Chapter I have ſufficiently anſwered before.

In Mr. *Stennet*'s fifth Chapter, I ſhall paſs over his drolling Reflections upon Mr. *Ruſſen*, and begin with his ſaying, *I know no Authority the Compoſers of Liturgies have to apply any one promiſe of Chriſt to Infant Baptiſm; Our Saviour never annexes a promiſe to any act which he has not required.* I anſwer, But if Chriſt hath required Baptiſm inſtead of Circumciſion, to introduce Children into his Church and Kingdom, as I have proved, then the promiſe of the forgiveneſs of Sin and of God's favour is annexed to it; not by the Compoſers of our Liturgies as he ſcandalouſly inſinuates, but by Chriſt, whoſe Ordinances and Promiſes, he and his Party Profanely Contemn. He adds, And as to

the Promiſes as made by Infants when Baptiz'd, to renounce the Devil, &c. they are incapable of entering into ſuch Engagements. Who ſays they are? But others may ingage in their Names, and for them, when they are to be admitted to a Privilege by all the Rules and Laws Humane and Divine, as I have already proved, and by the Cuſtom of Nations. What he ſays next, is not altogether true, *Whatever Obligation is upon them to devote themſelves to the Service of Chriſt when Adult, it does not ariſe from any Promiſe they made in Infancy, but from the Authority of the Divine Commands.* The Obligation to devote our ſelves to the ſervice of Chriſt, ariſeth from our Relation to him as Creatures, from his benefits confer'd upon us in Providence and Redemption, unto which we were admitted in our Baptiſm to be partakers; which Obligations were confirm'd and increas'd by the Promiſe then made in our Names, as well as by the Divine Commands. Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s Reaſon, *That the Vow of their Sureties cou'd not bind their Conſciences,* is Grounded upon a falſe Suppoſition, That it was the Sureties Vow; whereas by the expreſſions of the Rubrick, he might have underſtood that it was the Childrens Vow, declar'd for them in their Name by thoſe Charitable Friends. And that ſuch a Vow and Engagement is binding, our Church declares in the Catechiſm. *Which Promiſe when they come to Age themſelves,*

ſelves, i. e. the Children, *are bound to perform.* Mr. *Stennet* proceeds on in his miſtakes, by queſtioning the Lawfulneſs of ſuch a Vow. I muſt tell him, That this is a general and indiſputable Rule in this Caſe in Theology, that it is Lawful, and our Duty to Promiſe and Vow, when we are otherwiſe bound to perform, by the indiſpenſible Obligations of Creation, Providence, Benefaction, and Redemption. And that at this time, that we are enter'd into Chriſt's Church and Kingdom, and intitled to the Benefits of his Redemption in his Holy Ordinance, a Stipulation between him and his New Subjects, is lawful and reaſonable, and hath always been judg'd requiſite by Chriſtians in all Ages; and as Infants cannot make it for themſelves, their Sureties make it for them, for the obtaining the Beneſits. Were there no other Obligation but this, that we are thereby enroll'd amongſt Chriſt's Diſciples, and Subjects of his Spiritual Kingdom, it would be binding on us, to accompliſh ſuch Vows and Promiſes: Therefore we are ſo far from judging it a Temerity, that we think it our Duty, and a Duty that ſo great a Favour and an Honour deſerve from us, *To renounce the Devil and all his Works, &c.* And as often as we are call'd upon or required to enter into ſuch an engagement, we look upon it as a Sin to refuſe it. Were the Subſtance of the Baptiſmal Vow indifferent, Mr. *Stennet* might have reaſon for his

falſe Hypotheſis; but beſides the other great Obligations, the conſiderable advantages then procur'd to us, which would not have been granted without, engage our Conſciences to a Punctual Performance, as far as lies in our power, becauſe we reap the Benefits now and hereafter of ſuch Charitable Vows and Promiſes, tho' made without our previous or concurring conſent; but approved of by us afterwards with a thankful acknowledgement. Therefore what Mr. *Stennet* alledges out of Biſhop *Sanderſon*, relates not to our Caſe, which may be Paralell'd in our Courts of Judicature, in our Court Leets, and Court Barons, where *Guardians* of *Minors* anſwer, engage, and promiſe for them; which engagement and promiſe, when they come to Maturity they are bound to make good, becauſe they reap the benefit of ſuch Promiſes, by enjoying the grants. If any offer to refuſe to perform them, they forfeit their Eſtates, Honours, and Deeds. The caſe is the ſame here: If any for whom Sureties were ſo Charitable to engage and promiſe for them, at their Reception into Chriſt's Church by Baptiſm, will, when they come to years of Diſcretion, refuſe to obſerve ſuch Promiſes, they forfeit their Chriſtianity by their Apoſtacy and Rebellion. This is no prejudice to the Sureties, whoſe kindneſs is in no wiſe deſerving blame, but the Damage falls upon thoſe unworthy Wretches, who inſtead of ſerving Chriſt,

Chriſt, obey the Devil: Therefore the Concluſions that Mr. *Stennet* draws in the next Paragraph from theſe falſe Poſitions are Erroneous. And Mr *Stennet* miſtakes the next matter in Queſtion, which Mr. *Ruſſen* hath not well ſtated. We ſay that their Proſelytes, by being dipped by them, renounce their firſt Baptiſm, and the Benefits of it by being Rebaptized, not the Vows and Promiſes made in their Names, which as he ſays, are perſonally reiterated, when they enter into their Sect. They renounce likewiſe their firſt Profeſſion, and are Apoſtates to their Religion, by engaging themſelves amongſt a Party Enemies to it; by their declaring their firſt Baptiſm null and void, they deſpiſe, and by this act loſe all the Advantages there procur'd to them from the Mercy of God, as we ſhall obſerve in examining Apoſtacy and the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, of which many of 'em are Guilty. Mr. *Stennet* to juſtify himſelf and the *Anabaptiſts* in the next Place, from the Suſpicion of *Arianiſm*, and *Antitrinitarianiſm*, appeals to their Publick Confeſſions. I have this to reply here, That many of them may be Orthodox in this Article of our Creed; but I have known ſome Anabaptiſts guilty of this damnable Error, and that tho' their laſt Confeſſion of 1689, may be Publiſh'd in the name of that Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*, there are many of them who diſſent from the Doctrines there contain'd.

The Sixth long Chapter of Mr. *Stennet*'s Anſwer, that treats of Dipping, I have already examin'd in my Reply to *R. M.* and likewiſe his Seventh, where he vindicates the Authority and Commiſſion of his *Mechanick Teachers*, who intrude into the Miniſtry without a lawful Call. And I have alſo proved from the Word of God, That their common People have no Right of Election of their ſuperior Miniſters, nor any a Capacity for that purpoſe. Therefore 'tis no Blaſphemy or Slander, to call them Miniſters of Satan's Empire. Others, that diſcourſe of the Jeſuits Practices to promote the Principles of the *Anabaptiſts*, and of their Aſſemblies, Marriages, Extream Unction, and Burials, I ſhall paſs over to the Tenth Chapter, that anſwer's Mr. *R*'s Ninth Chapter, of the Heretical and Schiſmatical Tenents of the *Anabaptiſts*.

I ſhall not here juſtify Mr. *R*'s Charge againſt the *Anabaptiſts*, of being guilty of all the Errors that he imputes unto them; indeed the Foreign *Anabaptiſts* were condemn'd for, and infected with thoſe Hereſies; but ours in *England* bear a more plauſible Profeſſion; however, I find them divided and ſeparated in their Opinions. Theſe are they that I have taken particular notice of.

Firſt, *Free-will-Baptiſts*, who, as their Name imports, maintain a Free-will in Man to do Good or Evil: A Liberty in his Choice not deter-

determin'd, nor inclin'd inwardly by any Propenſity in Nature, but always abiding in an *æquilibrium*, till his Will weighs down the Balance. This Opinion is not agreeing with their Confeſſion of Faith. What other Poſitions theſe hold contrary to the Orthodox Belief, I cannot underſtand.

Secondly, *Particular-Baptiſts*, who fancy that God has made choice of a particular Number to be ſaved, and that they are in the Catalogue.

Thirdly, *Sabbath-day-Baptiſts*, or the obſervers of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, inſtead of the *Lord's-day*. Mr. *Stennet* acknowledges himſelf to be of that Opinion; and yet he appeals frequently to their publick Confeſſion of Faith, as the *Criterion* of the *Anabaptiſts* Religion, from which he varies in this Article. I ſhall prove the *Jewiſh Sabbath* to have been aboliſhed, and the *Lord's day*, the Day of the Reſurrection, to have been appointed in its ſtead: Therefore God's Command for the Obſervation of the *Seventh-day*, is in force only in relation to the *Sabbath* of our Lord and Saviour, who then reſted from his meritorious and great Work of Redemption. And our Prayer at the End of that Precept, *That God would incline our Hearts to keep this Law*, is deſign'd for the religious keeping that Day God hath appointed under the Goſpel. For the Scripture is expreſs, that this Day was obſerved and celebrated by St. *Paul*, and the *Gentile* Chri-

ſtians; and none but ſuch as were fond of the *Jewiſh* Rites, as Mr. *Stennet* ſeems to be, by maintaining the neceſſity of their Immerſions and Waſhings all over, as well as in this particular, left off the Obſervation of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, and kept the *Chriſtian* in lieu of it: Therefore St. *Paul* ſaith, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. *Let no Man judge you in Meat or Drink, or in reſpect of an Holy Day, or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath-days. Which are a ſhadow of things to come, but the Body is of Chriſt.*

Fourthly, *Soul-ſleeping-Baptiſts*, who maintain that the Souls of Men enter not into a State of Immortality at their Egreſs of the Body, but ſleep with their outward Tabernacles till the Day of the Reſurrection, when they ſhall revive again. This was the old *Arabian* Error, oppoſed by *Origen*, *Euſeb. lib. 6. cap.* 36. and taken up by ſome of the *Anabaptiſts* in the County of *Eſſex*. But it ſeems Mr. *Stennet* is Orthodox, and agrees with his Confeſſion of Faith in this Point.

Fifthly, *Pelagian-Baptiſts*, who deny Original Sin. I have in my cuſtody a long nonſenſical Letter, written to me by one *George Burr*, an *Anabaptiſt*, an Oatmeal-Man, living about *Drury-Lane* againſt Original Sin. And I believe many are infected with that Hereſy amongſt the *Anabaptiſts*.

Sixthly, *Socinian-Baptiſts*, who deny the Divinity of our Saviour, and are Enemies of

of the Holy Trinity. I have discours'd with one *John Webbe*, whose Name I find in the *Anabaptists* Confession of Faith, *A.* 1644. He was a desperate *Unitarian*, and died lately a Pensioner of one of the Companies of *London*, having wasted all his Substance. This wicked Heresy hath poison'd the Judgments of many of this Sect, tho' it is contrary to their last Confession of Faith.

Seventhly, *Legs of Mutton-Baptists*, so named, because at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, as they pretend, they sit down at Table, and Feast themselves with Legs of Mutton and other Meats, at the time of breaking the Bread, and distributing the Wine. I can hear but of one Congregation of them, in *Lambert-Street* near *White-Chappel*.

Eighthly, *Antinomian-Baptists*, whose absurd Opinions concerning the Law of God, Faith, Salvation, and our Relation to Christ, are reckon'd up by Mr. *Pagitt*, in his *Heresiography*. The *Antinomians* first appear'd in *New-England* at *Boston*, and open'd a Door to all Debauchery and Wickedness, by their Abominable Doctrines. Divers of our *Anabaptists* have entertain'd their Principles.

Ninthly, *Millennian-Baptists*, or *Millennaries*, who fansie that Christ shall come to reign on Earth one Thousand Years, and that they are to prepare for his coming, by destroying all the Ungodly. This was the Opinion of the

Fifth-

Fifth-Monarchy-Baptiſts, which ſtir'd them up to that Mad Inſurrection, in the Beginning of King *Charles* II's Reign.

I muſt here take notice, that all *Anabaptiſts* plead Holy Scripture, as far as they think it will agree with their Principles and Opinions; but either reject it, or give it a falſe Interpretation, when they find that it contradicts their Errors. And their common Practice is to boaſt of Holy Scripture to be of their ſide, and to perſwade the ignorant and unadviſed, That *Pædobaptiſm* is a Popiſh Error retain'd by the Proteſtants; That the firſt Ages never admitted any to Baptiſm, till they could profeſs Faith and Repentance; That Dipping was then the conſtant Mode of Baptiſm; That they are no Chriſtians, who uſe any other Method but a total Immerſion of the Body; That therefore whoever deſires to partake of the Redemption of Chriſt, muſt be Re-baptized by them; That the Ordinances are by them Adminiſtred in the greateſt Purity; and that their Perſwaſion recommends nothing but Holineſs and Sanctification, Love and Charity to Men, Piety and Zeal to God. By theſe Inſinuations they have ſhaken the Faith of many ſimple Souls, and drawn them to their Profeſſion. And in reading Mr. *Stennet*'s Book, one would think him to be an *Angel* come down from Heaven, or one of thoſe *Seraphims* of Love and Light, ſent to inſtruct the *Pædobaptiſts* and the World. How often does he

boaſt

boaſt of the Doctrines of the *Anabaptiſts* founded on the Word of God? As if he had produced, and could ſhew expreſs Texts of Holy Scripture, to forbid the Baptiſm of Infants, and to command the Mode of dipping over Head and Ears; whereas neither he nor any of them, can pretend to conclude any ſuch Doctrines or Practices, but from Suppoſitions and uncertain Conſequences; upon which ſandy Foundation the whole Fabrick of their Religion and Separation is built. Could they have as plain a Text of Holy Scripture, to forbid Children to come to Chriſt, as we have to bring them, they might have ſome Plea for their Profeſſion: Could they produce any Paſſage to prove Baptiſm a needleſs Ordinance, in order to Salvation; or that Children are to be excluded from it; or that Sprinkling is not the Mode, but only Dipping, we ſhould be ready to applaud and approve the Diſcovery. But while we have Holy Scripture, Reaſon, and the Practice of the Univerſal and Catholick Church of all Ages and Nations on our ſide, recommending the Baptiſm of Infants, and allowing the Mode of Sprinkling to be ſufficient and lawful, we have cauſe to reject this new Sect and their Doctrines, as pernicious, contrary to the Mind and Intereſt of Chriſt, and deſtructive to the Souls of Infants.

Again, When we examine further, what a Deviliſh Brood of Errors and Hereſies are harbour'd

harbour'd under this Sect, and countenanced by their Teachers, *Socinianiſm*, *Arianiſm*, *Judaiſm*, *Chilianiſm*, &c. we cannot look upon this Sect as tolerable, but as a Complication and Rendezvouz of Divers Damnable Hereſies; for tho' their Confeſſion of Faith ſpeaks the contrary, under this Name of the *Anabaptiſts* they cannot deny but all theſe grievous Hereſies are entertain'd and ſhelter'd. That they are Hereticks upon the Account of denying Baptiſm to Infants, I prove it by the Definition of Mr. *Tombes*: *Whoever holdeth any Error in Religion, and labours to make a Party for it, is an Heretick.* We may add, that they are ſome of the worſt of Hereticks, when we conſider the wicked and woful Conſequence formerly mention'd, of their Principles and Doctrines.

Mr. *Stennet*, at the latter end of his Book miſ-interprets, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. the *Holineſs* of Believers Children, to be underſtood of *Legitimacy*, and their *Uncleanneſs of Illegitimacy*, which cannot be the Meaning of the Apoſtle; for among the Pagans, Children were lawfully born in Matrimony; if that were able to qualify them *Holy*, they who were ſo born in Wedlock deſerv'd that Title. Neither can this Word *Holy* declare them to be Church-Members without Baptiſm, the introducting Ordinance. This Expoſition was embraced by ſeveral of the Ancient Fathers, who from hence concluded, that

that they were baptized in their Infancy. Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s Concluſion is inſignificant, *That all Adult Children may be ſuppoſed to have been Church-Members too, as ſoon as one of their Parents became a Believer.* Whatever ſome may affirm, none can be reckon'd truly Church-Members, until they be initiated into the Church and Covenant by Baptiſm. Neither can any Holineſs be appropriated to the Children, according to St. *Paul*'s meaning, who were born before either Parent was a Believer, but to ſuch as were born ſince their Chriſtianity. When I examine the *Apoſtle*'s Argument, I cannot but approve of Mr. *Stennet*'s firſt Concluſion, *That the Holineſs of the Children here ſpoken of, muſt be derived as well from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent, as that of the Believer.* But I deny the ſecond, that limits their Holineſs to a *Legitimacy* only, for the Reaſon afore-mention'd. Now for the better underſtanding of St. *Paul*, we are to mind God's Promiſe to *Abraham* and his Believing Seed, *I will be thy God and of thy Seed after thee.* When therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, That the believing Husband or Wife ſanctifies the unbelieving Partner, 'tis to be underſtood in relation to the Children that are born of them, who are therefore ſaid to be Holy; for God claims a Right to the Seed of ſuch a Parent, tho' the other be an Infidel, becauſe one is a Believer. Therefore this Sanctification can't be underſtood of

the

the Perſon who continues in his Infidelity, but only in relation to the Act of Generation, as they perform the Part of a Husband or Wife. Their Seed, that iſſue from them, their Children, that are born, are as it were God's Heritage, Chriſt's Peculium; therefore Holy by a Deſignation, not only from their Parents, as Mr. *Stennet* ſaith, but from God himſelf, to be his Servants. From hence it neceſſarily follows, that as ſoon as they are born, they are to be brought to Chriſt, enter'd into his Church, and dedicated to God by Baptiſm. 'Tis for that purpoſe that St. *Paul* ſaith, That the believing Husband or Wife ſanctifies the Seed of the unbelieving, by virtue of this Promiſe; God challenging that Child as his. And if they be thus Holy by God's Deſignation, I may ſpeak as the Voice did to *Peter*, *Acts* 10. *What God hath cleanſed, that call not thou common.* And if they are thus Holy by Deſignation only from the Womb, doubtleſs they have a Right to the Seal of Holineſs and Sanctification, to the Laver of Regeneration, to free them from Original Guilt and Corruption. Therefore Mr. *Stennet*'s Inferences from his erroneous Suppoſitions are falſe; and his Aſſertion, *That he hath proved before, that a credible Profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, ought to be made by all thoſe who are admitted to Baptiſm, before they can be accounted proper Subjects of that Ordinance*, is not true. We acknowledge thoſe Conditions

Conditions are required in the Adult; but Infants, as we have made it appear from the Word of God, *&c.* are to be admitted without any ſuch actual or perſonal Profeſſion. I intreat Mr. *Stennet*, a Man of Learning and Abilities, but engaged in his erroneous Sect, to weigh theſe Reaſons, to examine my Arguments; and, if he has any love for Truth and Unity, to act for the time to come as an unprejudiced Conſcience can adviſe and direct him, for the Glory of God, and the Good of Souls. And I cannot but lament, that ſuch a Perſon ſo well qualified, as he ſeems to be, ſhould be ſo deeply plung'd and dipp'd over Head and Ears, and ſtick ſo faſt in a Spiritual Quaqmire, in an Heretical Sect, as St. *Auguſtine* was in that of the *Manichees* Nine Years, as he confeſſeth. I pray God to open his Eyes, that he may ſee his Errors, and repent for the Miſchief that he hath done to the Church of God, and to the Evangelical Truths, by his fallacious Wit and Reaſoning in his Book; and let him ſeriouſly conſider how many weak Souls he has thereby deſtroy'd and deluded, for whom he muſt be accountable to our Great Judge.

Mr.

Mr. Joſeph Hooke's *fallacious* Apology *for the* Baptized Believers, *in Anſwer to Mr.* Eratt, *Vicar of* Hatfield *near* Doncaſter, *in* Yorkſhire; *briefly examin'd by the Word of God, and Right Reaſon.*

THE Occaſion of publiſhing this Apology, was one *John Woodward*, Mr. *Eratt*'s Pariſhioner, perverted to the Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*. This good and zealous Miniſter of Chriſt, as his Duty oblig'd him, repreſented in writing to the *Apoſtate* his hainous Crime, with juſt Reflections upon that Heretical and Schiſmatical Party. Upon reading Mr. *Eratt*'s Letter, this *Joſeph Hooke*, as he ſtiles himſelf an *Apoſtle*, ordain'd by *Stanley* and *Grantham*, writes and publiſhes this deceitful *Apology*, which he ſtuffs with the moſt impudent Falſities, bold Forgeries, groundleſs Suppoſitions, erroneous Principles, and grievous Miſtakes, both in Holy Scripture and Hiſtory: All this he delivers for Goſpel, to deceive his ignorant Proſelytes, and the credulous Mob. And to gain more Credit, and procure Acceptance to his Hypocritical Performance, he profeſſeth nothing but Meekneſs, Charity, Love, and Friendſhip to our Church and People, while his whole Deſign is to deny us a Right to Chriſtianity, and

cut

cut our Throats. From ſuch Diabolical Friends and Friendſhip, Good Lord deliver us!

Through his Book, in every Page, a bold, preſumptuous ſubtil and lying Spirit of Satan, is remarkable diſguiſed and mask'd under a Chriſtian Vizard. I ſhall begin to examine his Firſt Chapter, where he ſaith, *That the People called* Anabaptiſts, *are not rightly ſo called, and are no new Sect.* I am to prove the contrary. Now the Juſtice of this Title given to them, depends upon our Right Mode of Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, which we practiſe either in Dipping or Sprinkling in Infancy. This we judge to be lawful, in obedience to his Invitation and Command. If we be in the Right, as I have fully proved, and our Adverſaries Judgment erroneous, as certainly it is in this Caſe, their Dipping muſt be a Rebaptization, not into the Chriſtian Church, which by that Act their Proſelytes renounce, but into their Sect: Therefore they are properly nam'd *Anabaptiſts.* A Sect that lays ſuch a Streſs upon Dipping over Head and Ears, that they account all *Chriſtians* who have not a total Immerſion, to be yet in the State of Nature, without God and Chriſt, and out of the Covenant of Grace. *J. H.* pretends, that they are for mending an Error in our Baptiſm; but until they can prove by the Word of God, that there is one in baptizing our Infants, as Chriſt hath appointed,

pointed, by the Application of Water, as our Church preſcribes, they are under a great Miſtake, and deſerve the Name of *Anabaptiſts.*

I cannot but here take notice, That *J. Hooke* adds an improper Queſtion to our *Rubrick*, that is not there. As if the Miniſter ſhould queſtion the People, after they had witneſſed, that the Child had been baptized with Water, and in the Name of the Father, *&c. Whether think you the Child be lawfully and perfectly baptized?* Our Church declares, after the Anſwer to the Two firſt Queſtions, all things to be well done, and does not doubt of the Legality or Perfection of the Adminiſtration. To appeal afterwards to the Opinion of the Aſſiſtants, *Whether the Child had been lawfully and perfectly baptized?* was nonſenſe, and would betray a Weakneſs in our Judgments and Rules, of which we were never guilty. But this Man, as the reſt of his Comrades, is for Forgery and Lying, without which he cannot ſupport his wicked Perſwaſion. I ſhall diſcover many more, in the Sequel of his *Apology.*

Now what reaſon have theſe People to claim the Name of Chriſtian, as proper only to them? ſince by adhering to, and engaging themſelves in this Sect by being Dipped, they have denied their firſt *Chriſtianity*, as a Nullity. What reaſon have they to challenge the Title of *Baptized Believers*, or *Baptized Chriſtians?* as if none were *Baptized*

ized Chriſtians, and *Baptized Believers*, but hey. They may be called *Dippers*, and a *Dipping-Sect*; but I deny their Baptiſm to be egal, becauſe perform'd by ſuch Perſons, who have no Authority from our Lord to dminiſter his Sacraments, and becauſe 'tis in Contradiction to ours lawfully and juſtly erform'd. Neither is that other Title roper to this Sect, which *J. H.* affects: *A People of the Primitive Chriſtian Religion*, ince none of the Primitive Times who allowed of Baptiſm, did ever deny it to Infants, if we may believe St. *Auguſtine*, and the Ancient Records. And the Mode of Sprinkling was ever practiſed in the Church, and reckon'd lawful, as I have already proved. Likewiſe ſuch as were baptized in Infancy, were, by all Sects and Diviſions of Chriſtianity, judg'd to be lawfully Baptized, till the *Anabaptiſts* appeared. Therefore this Name that he aſcribes to his Sect, is improper, and contrary to Truth: They are a Sect of a later Date, not yet Two Hundred Years ſtanding. He ſaith next, *If we are miſtaken we cannot help it.* That they are miſtaken is moſt certain, and ſufficiently proved, both in reſpect of the Subjects and Mode of Baptiſm; and they might help and rectify their Miſtakes, if they would ſet aſide their Prejudices and Partiality, and ſincerely hearken to Holy Scripture, Reaſon, and the unanimous Conſent of all the Ancient and Modern Churches of Chriſt,

Christ, who ever did and do yet Baptize their Infants, and approve of Sprinkling as lawful. He adds; *'Tis our Unhappiness but no Damming Sin.* I answer, 'tis not so much their Unhappiness as their wilful Blindness, Perverseness, and Obstinacy. And I appeal to all Mankind whether an Apostacy from a Church of Christ, as ours is, to a Schismatical and Heretical Sect, be not a damning Sin? Don't they, deserve Damnation upon another account; for excluding so many Infant Souls out of the Covenant and Church of Christ, and Condemning them to remain in the Polluted State of Nature, under the Empire of Satan, in opposition to our Lord's Will and Command? Is not so Pernicious a Rebellion and Disobedience against Christ's expres Orders, a Damning Sin?

The next Question is, *Whether the Anabaptists be a New or Old Sect*; for the better understanding this Question, we are to have a Right Definition and Notion of this Sect, as it appears amongst us. In my apprehension 'tis a Sect maintaining a Separation from the Orthodox and Establish'd Church of Christ in the Nation; or to speak in their language, from our National Church, divided from its Communion, because of Infant-Baptism, the mode of Sprinkling in usage amongst us, and other exceptions against our Religion and Worship. Which Sect declares our Baptism and Christianity Null upon that account, therefore dippeth all Persons

ns that joyn with them. Now that any ch Sect was ever in being before *Nicholas orke* and *Thomas Muncer* began it in *Germa-*, *A. D.* 1521, or 1522. no Hiſtory nor ecord can be Produc'd. *Melancton* a Wor-y Divine and Zealous Reformer, *Sleidan* his Commentaries and other credible Au-nors make mention of their firſt appea-ance, which was uſher'd into the Credulous Vorld by feigned Viſions, and pretended evelations, and was attended by a diſmal rain of Rebellions, Murders, Thefts, acrileges, Adulteries, and other horrid rimes acted by theſe Religious Sectaries; heir firſt coming into *England* out of *Hol-and* was about the year 1535; but they never nade any Figure till about the beginning of ur Civil Wars 1642 or 1643. when they Aſſociated into Seven diſtinct Congregations, nd Publiſh'd their firſt Confeſſion of Faith, ubſcribed by Fifteen Perſons in the Names of even Churches in *London*. Now to make right judgment of the beginning of this ect, we muſt take this Body of Men as really t is, with all its Eſſentials and Circumſtan-es, as we have deſcribed it, and we dare affirm, That no ſuch Sect was ever known n any Nation before the Year 1521. Some efore that time may have entertain'd divers rrors that theſe Sectaries now embrace, as he *Antitrinitarians*, who denied the Trinity s our *Socinian Anabaptiſts* do; the *Pelagians* who were againſt Original Sin, yet were for

Infant

Infant-Baptiſm; but our *Pelagian-Anabaptiſts* agree with them in the firſt perſwaſion; but differ in the other. The *free-will Anabaptiſts* are infected with the Errors of the *Donatiſts*, *Encratiſts*, *Cathari*, and *Novatians*. The *Fifth-Monarchy-Anabaptiſts* are of the opinion of the Ancient *Chiliaſts*; So of the other old Hereſies that ſome of the *Anabaptiſt* Congregations do now receive, which cannot make this Sect of the ſame Ancient date becauſe thoſe Primitive Hereticks Condemn'd as ſuch by all the Churches of Chriſt differ'd not in Infant Baptiſm from them, nor ſeparated from the *Catholicks* of thoſe days upon that account, as ours do from us. That ſome otherwiſe Orthodox *Chriſtians* in the firſt Ages were for *Rebaptization* of Penitent *Apoſtates* and Converted *Hereticks*, is not denied: But thoſe Men, as *Cyprian* and others, never refuſed Baptiſm to Infants, nor judg'd the Mode of Sprinkling to be unlawful; and never canton'd or divided into a diſtinct Sect from the reſt of Chriſtians, for ſuch Practices, as ours do: Therefore 'tis unreaſonable to challenge their Beginning but from thoſe, who firſt commenced the Separation for the ſame Reaſons and Cauſes for which theſe amongſt us maintain theirs. Now before *Nicholas Storke*, *Thomas Muncer*, *John of Leyden*, and the *German* and *Munſter* Rebellions, we find no ſuch Separation upon the ſame account in any credible Hiſtory. *J. H.* labours to wipe off the ſtain, and ſhift off the reproach

of

of the filthy practices and abominable actions of the *Munſter-Anabaptiſts*, which indeed concern not ſuch of them as are peaceable-minded amongſt us, were it not that the ſame Spirit of Confuſion that was in thoſe firſt Sectaries, appears in many of our *Anabaptiſt-Zealots*. It dares not now act over the ſame *Tragedies* for fear of the Laws. What he ſaith to excuſe his *German* Brethren, That ſome *Lutherans*, not *Baptiſts*, were Ring-Leaders and chief Promoters of that Sedition, is falſe. There might have been ſome diſturbance before, occaſion'd by the Preaching of the Goſpel in that City from the Papiſts; but as ſoon as this Sect got the upper hand, which they obtain'd by Fighting and Murder of the *Evangelicks*; one of their Preachers proclaim'd in the Streets of the City, That all ſhould be deſtroyed that were not Baptized again, and the *Lutherans* were Baniſh'd and threatned with Death, as ſoon as *John of Leyden* had been Proclaim'd King of *Sion*; as for *Bernard Rotman*, 'tis true he had been a *Lutheran* Preacher, but he became an *Apoſtate*, and joyn'd with that Sect in the Rebellion, and in promoting the perſwaſion and Kingdom of the Anabaptiſts: The Foundation being laid and begun at *Munſter*, was likely to ſpread further, and take in *Amſterdam*, had not this *Fanatical Crue* been prevented and ſuppreſſed. The truth of this Relation appears ſo plain from the Atteſtations of *Sleidan*, *Hortenſius*, *Pontanus*, *Oſiander*,

Melancton, and other worthy Historians of those Days and Countries, who writ of these Transactions upon their certain knowledge, that we have more reason to believe them than Dr. *Will. Russell*, or *Tileman Jan van Bright*, or any other prejudiced *Anabaptist* of our Days. And as for the Multitudes of the *Waldenses* in *Bohemia* of his Perswasion 'tis altogether false; for by their Confessions of Faith, they declared to be for Infant Baptism, as we have already proved. He tells us next of the Being of the Anabaptists in the Reign of *Theodosius* and *Honorius*, which is an untruth, that no Historian of those Days ever mentioned: That the Ancient Christian *Britains* were against Infant-Baptism, when *Austin* the Monk came over from *Gregory* Bishop of *Rome*, to Preach the Gospel to the *Saxons*, is a great Error, taken up by Mr. *Danvers* from a Fabulous Historian, *Fabian*, who is contradicted by *Beda* and others. They approved not of the Innovations of the *Romish* Church, and refus'd to comply with its Baptism, but never denied the Baptism of Infants. For *Pelagius* one of that Nation, tho' he own'd no Original Sin, yet he approved of Infant Baptism, as I have made it appear. With what Confidence could Mr. *Danvers*, and after him *J. H.* and other *Anabaptist writers* bely those *British Christians* and the Ancient *Waldenses? Paul Perin*, in his History, justifies them from these false Accusations of the lying Monks and Friers,

Friars, their ſworn Enemies and Perſecutors, by mentioning one of their Books, named *The Spiritual Almanack*, where they clear'd themſelves of the falſe ſurmiſes againſt them. And ſome of their Poſterity, at a *Synod* held at *Angrogne*, *A. D.* 1535. declared that the Baptiſm of Infants had been acknowledg'd by their Forefathers for ſome Hundreds of years before, as it is expreſſed in *Perin's Hiſtory Wald. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *Oecolampadius* writ to them a very Religious Letter to confirm them in the Faith. He had diſputed before with ſome *Anabaptiſts* at *Bazil*, *Ulm*, and *Ausburg*, about the year 1527 and 1529. If they forbore the Baptiſm of their Children, 'twas becauſe they would not have them initiated into the Popiſh Religion; they delayed till their own Miniſters came to them. This might give occaſion for their Adverſaries, as the *Abbots of Clugny* and *Clarenvaux*, and other Popiſh Monks, to faſten upon them this lying and grievous Slander, That they were againſt Infant Baptiſm, which I cannot find to be true after a diligent peruſal of the unprejudiced Hiſtorians of that Time.

For the *Fifth-Monarchy* Inſurrection, *J. H.* ſays falſly, That there was but One *Anabaptiſt* amongſt them. I find two expreſly Named by Mr. *Pagitt*, that ſigned their firſt Confeſſion of Faith 1644, *i. e. Kiffin* and *Patience*; and 'tis certain *Venner*, *Hodgkin*, *Gowler*, and others were of that perſwaſion. Likewiſe *John James* the Small-coal-man was an A-

nabaptiſt Preacher. He was Executed at *Tyburn* the 27th of *November* 1661. for Treaſon. The reſt concern'd in that mad attempt are juſtly thought to be of the ſame Opinion; but diſtinguiſhed from the other Anabaptiſts by their *Millennary Perſwaſion*, which cauſeth them to fanſie, That Temporal Dominion and Poſſeſſion ought to be founded in Grace, and the Godly only are to inherit the Earth. Many of the moſt Eminent Anabaptiſts lean to this Opinion, and *J. H.* gives us cauſe, Page 53. to ſuſpect him to be of that Sect, by the Texts that he Quotes for that purpoſe. Now *J. H.* would have our Holy Jeſus. our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour, to be the firſt Author and Founder of his Sect; but if it believes and practices contrary to the Mind and Goſpel of our Redeemer, it could never procceed from him; for our Gracious Maſter was for Union amongſt all his Followers, *John* 17. 21. The Anabaptiſts are for Separation, not only from all true Chriſtian People, but alſo amongſt themſelves. Jeſus held Communion with the *Jews*, tho' Superſtitious in ſome obſervances, *John* 6. 2 But this Sect is canton'd into divers diſtinct Congregations, that have broke off all Fellowſhip in Divine Worſhip with us, upon idle Surmiſes and ill grounded Suſpicions. *Jeſus* Invited Children to come to him, *Mark* 10 14. This Sect forbids them. *Jeſus* tells us, That of ſuch is the Kingdom of God, *Matt.* 19. 14. The Anabaptiſts exclude

exclude them, by denying to them admittance. *Jeſus* would have them enter'd into his Covenant, *Gen* 17. The Anabaptiſts won't allow them that privilege. Our Holy *Jeſus* was kind and merciful to Babes; The Anabaptiſts are ſo cruel and barbarous to leave them in the Precincts of Satan's Empire, out of any Perſonal Right to the Kingdom and Redemption of Chriſt. In many other particulars they are quite contrary to the Rules, Commands, and Religion of our Bleſſed *Jeſus*; therefore they can no more pretend to ſo Divine an Author, than the Jeſuits who Glory in his Name, and claim him as their Original. If we may believe *Bullinger*, *Zuinglius*, *Melancton* and other Reformers of our Religion from the abuſes of Popery, who ſaw the firſt Appearance of this Sect, The Devil was the principal Founder of the Anabaptiſt perſwaſion. The reaſon that we have to judge ſo, is becauſe it tends to promote and encreaſe his Empire, and multiply the Subjects of his Kingdom, by excluding a Number of Infant-Souls out of the Kingdom of Chriſt, and leaving them out of the ordinary and appointed way of Salvation. *J. H* in challenging Chriſt for the Author of his Sect, follows the footſteps of the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, and all other Hereticks Condemn'd by the Churches of Chriſt; for they father'd themſelves upon him, and Uſurp'd the Honour of his bleſſed Name, while they

undermin'd his intereſt, Religion and Goſpel. To confirm the Ignorant in this Opinion, *J. H.* mentions a number of Men, who ſuffer'd, ſome for Rebellion, others for Religion, but few or none for the bare perſwaſion of the Anabaptiſts; yet he hath the Confidence to challenge them all as his: Whereas after they of *Zurick* had diſputed, and been ſilenced by *Zuinglius* in the preſence of the *Senate*, they continued to be Rebellious and Seditious; for which they ſuffer'd, as they deſerved, a Death by Drowning. Doubtleſs the *Dutch-Anabaptiſts Martyrology* may have a number of feigned *Stories* and *Speeches*, as our Bloody Aſſizes of the *Weſt of England*, of which we ſhall take Notice in the Hiſtory. I know that Book to be Romantick, and moſt of the Dying Speeches to be Fabulous.

J. H. vainly and falſly pretends that they have no need of Ancient Records to prove the Antiquity of their Sect, while, as he ſays, they can prove all that they teach by the infallible Record of God's word; and that they can make it appear by that one Book, that their Perſwaſion is as old as Chriſt and his Apoſtles. But with what a falſe and impudent fancy this Man flatters himſelf and his Proſelytes, I have already evidenc'd by the former Proofs of Infant-Baptiſm from Holy Scripture, Reaſon, and Antiquity.

This

This *J. H.* endeavours to prove in his Second Chapter, where he affirms, *That the Doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is according to the Scriptures.* He ſhould have excepted the *Socinian Anabaptiſts*, the *Pelagian*, the *Antinomian*, and the *Anabaptiſts of Germany*, who ſaid, *That Chriſt did not aſſume his Fleſh from the Virgin Mary*; *That he is not true God, but only endowed with more Gifts than other Men, &c.* He ſhould have excepted thoſe other diviſions of Anabaptiſts amongſt us, that maintain moſt damnable Errors, and are for *Polygamy*, or Promiſcuous Copulation, as the *Adamites* and others. My Author confeſſeth a difference amongſt them, and ſuch differences as are againſt the Fundamental Articles of our Creed. Therefore to aſſert in general Terms, That the Doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is according to the Scripture, is a falſe aſſertion; but pray let us examine, how agreeable the Doctrine of the moſt Orthodox of this Sect is to the Holy Scripture; for ſeveral of their Creeds I have examin'd, and find them differ and contradict one another; therefore they can't be all true: Indeed they are to be look'd upon as decoys to catch Wild-fowls in a Pond, or as Blinds, Beautiful Vizards to cheat the World into a good opinion of their Sect; for by their Conformity to our Orthodox Faith in moſt Articles, of which they make a great Oſtentation in their Printed Books, they would perſwade Mankind, that there is no

difference between us, but in the Subjects and Mode of Baptiſm; whereas the moſt noted of them are known to be *Jewiſh Sabbitarians*, *Antinomians*, *Socinians*, *Unitarians*, *Arians*, *Millennaries*, *Adamites*, and ſome are *Blaſphemous Hereticks*, *&c.* All theſe are contain'd under the Name of *Anabaptiſts*, who glory in their Publick Confeſſions, and yet are of a contrary perſwaſion. I would ask *J. H.* If the Doctrines of theſe and ſuch like Enemies of the true Chriſtian Religion and Faith, be according to the Scripture? To what purpoſe do they own the Holy Scriptures, as the infallible Rule of Faith and Chriſtianity, ſince he, and the moſt regular of this Sect, contradict and wreſt them to the perverting of the true Senſe, and refuſe to be Govern'd by them. For Inſtance, The *Holy Scriptures* Command Believers Infants to be Seal'd with the Seal of God's Covenant, *Gen.* 17 11. But the Anabaptiſts will not ſuffer them. The *Holy Scriptures* appropriate the promiſe to be the God of *Abraham*'s Seed, and the Covenant to Chriſt and his Believing Diſciples, *Acts* 2. 39. *Gal.* 3. 16. 17; but the Anabaptiſts ſay, The Covenant and Promiſes were made only with *Abraham*'s Carnal Seed, *Keach*'s *Rector rectifi'd*, p. 45. The *Holy Scripture* orders Sucklings to be brought and come to Chriſt, *Mark* 10. 14; but the *Anabaptiſts* forbid them. The *Holy Scripture* ſaith, *Except a Perſon be born of Water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom*

Kingdom of God, *John* 3. 5. but the Anabaptiſts teach, That their Infants and others enter into God's Kingdom without the Ordinance or Baptiſm of Water, *Confeſ.* p 38. and Scoff at our Obedience to Chriſt's Command and Practice; and they boldly affirm, that this Text requires no Material Water, contrary to *Epheſ.* 5. 26. and *Titus* 3 5. The *Holy Scripture* leaves to the Wiſdom of the Governours of a Nation and Church, the Circumſtantial part of God's Worſhip, to be order'd by the Light of Nature, and their Chriſtian Prudence, giving general directions for that purpoſe, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1 *Cor.* 14. 26, 40. as one of their Confeſ. acknowlegeth p. 6. But *J. H.* and other Anabaptiſts reject our *Rubrick*, *Common Prayer*, *Liturgy*, and Publick Worſhip, order'd according to this Scripture Rule, by the Wiſdom of the Nation, p. 34. to follow the dictates of their Giddy Brain. The *Holy Scripture* calls Sprinkling Baptiſm, *Heb.* 9. 10. as I have fully proved; but the Anabaptiſts won't yield to that Scripture Senſe of the word; but give more credit to *Heſiod*, *Homer*, *Demoſthenes*, *Plutarch*, *&c.* than to the Spirit of God. The *Holy Scripture* enjoyns us the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace, *Epheſ.* 4. 3. and to be of one mind in Religion, and the Service of God, *Phil.* 1. 27. 1 *Pet.* 3. 8. *Rom.* 15. 6. But the Anabaptiſts are for Diviſion and Subdiviſion, for ſeparate Congregations, *Confeſ.*

c. 26. And they are ſo ridiculous to quarrel at our Union in a National Church, as if that were inconſiſtent with the Mind of Chriſt, *J. H.* p. 99. The Holy Scripture recommends to us a Miniſtry of God's and Chriſt's appointment and ſending, *Matth.* 20. 2. *John* 17. 18, 20, 21. *Acts* 20. 28; but the Anapabtiſts will have none of God's choice and ſending, but of the Peoples Election, and Commiſſioned by them, Confeſ. p. 88, 89. St. *Paul* foretold, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. *After their own Luſts ſhall they heap to themſelves Teachers, having itching Ears.* The *Holy Scripture* hath aſſigned to Chriſt a *Sovereignty* and *Monarchy* over his Church, *Matth* 23. 1. *Luke* 1. 32, 33. But the Anabaptiſts have chang'd the Fundamental Conſtitution of Chriſt's Kingdom, and have alter'd it into a *Democracy*, where the People, who ſhould be Taught and Govern'd, have Uſurp'd the Supreme Authority to Command in Chief, to Teach, Controul, and Govern, contrary to the whole Current of Scripture.

I could alledge many more Particulars, in which their Doctrines and Practices are directly and plainly contrary to the *Holy Scriptures*, and the Mind of Chriſt. Therefore tho' *J. H.* and others of his Sect, may be Orthodox in Relation to the Trinity, the Divine and Humane Nature of Chriſt, and other Fundamental Articles of our Religion, he and all his *Anabaptiſts* are erroneous.

ous and heretical more or less, and maintain Tenets contrary to the Blessed Word of God. Their whole Religion is opposite to Christ and his Kingdom, and tends to advance the Devil's Interest and Dominion. Now considering the Premises, how vainly and falsly does Mr. *Hooke*, Mr. *Keach*, and their Deluded Comrades the *Anabaptists*, Deceivers of the People, boast of, and appeal to Holy Scripture and Divine Revelation, as if their Schism and Errors were founded in that Book of Truth. And 'tis remarkable that their Booksellers and Shopkeepers frequently glory in, and assert the *Bible* for their Signs. I can't compare them better than to an Hypocritical Fellow mention'd by *Erasmus*, who always carried about under his Arm a great Bossed *Bible*, but never look'd into it, or took any Direction from it. Their often proposing the Divine Scriptures as their Rule, is but an empty and vain Ostentation to deceive the credulous Vulgar. They have not one direct Syllable, that they can produce against Infant-Baptism, or the Mode of Sprinkling, out of the Word of God. What he saith next in relation to Humane and Divine Studies and Learning, concerns not our present purpose. Therefore having examin'd already his 3d. Chap. I pass over to his 4th, where I find a plain Contradiction in the Title: *A friendly Separation of the Baptized Believers, from the present Church of* England, *shewed to be Just and Necessary.*

Neceſſary. An Hypocritical and Nonſenſical Title! as falſe and irrational as the Author. For can there be a friendly Diviſion in Religion? A friendly Schiſm? no more than a friendly Civil War. Can Friendſhip, the Product of Charity, that thinketh no Evil, be the Ground of the *Anabaptiſts* Separation from our Church? To pretend therefore Friendſhip in this Caſe, is the deepeſt Hypocriſy, and a meer Paradox. But what are the legal Cauſes, that this Apoſtle, not of Chriſt, but of the grand Author of Diviſion, pretends for his ſeparating from our Church? He mentions Seven.

Firſt, *Becauſe we cannot find ſhe is as old as the Scriptures.* And what Church is there in the World, beſides the *Jewiſh*, ſo ancient? Are the *Anabaptiſt* Congregations, that never made any Appearance amongſt us Fourſcore Years ago, of an equal Date with the Scriptures? What a childiſh and frivolous Reaſon is this for a Breach of Unity? What matter is it, how lately the Church of *England* is eſtabliſh'd a Church, if it be conformable to the Rules of the Goſpel? All the Churches now in the World, had a Beginning. The Churches of *Italy*, *Rome*, *Aſia*, *Greece*, *Egypt*, *Ethiopia*, &c. were ſettled ſince the Scriptures, by the Apoſtles. If the Proſelytes had been allowed to forſake them for ſuch a ſlender Punctilio, none would have held Communion with them long. If the Churches be ſettled according to the Laws

Laws of God, and the Mind of Chriſt, the Date of its firſt Eſtabliſhment is inſignificant. Were there any Doctrines to be embrac'd, or ſuperſtitious Practices requir'd in our Church, ſo as to render the Profeſſors and Conformiſts criminal before God, it would be a lawful Plea for a Separation: But only becauſe our Church is not as old as the Goſpel, tho' it is agreeable to it, to leave and fall off from it, is a fooliſh Pretence and Act, that none but Brain-ſick People can be guilty of. He mentions Five Pillars, upon which he ſaith our Church is built: *Firſt*, The Book of Conſecration of *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, of *Prieſts* and *Deacons*; all which relate to the orderly Government of our Church, ratified by the Wiſdom of our Parliaments, whoſe Authority by this Separation they deſpiſe and reject. The 2*d* is, Our *Liturgy* or *Common-Prayer*, which he ſcoffs at. The 3*d* is, Our Thirty-nine *Articles* of our Confeſſion of Faith. The 4*th* is, The Book of *Canons*. The *Fifth* are, The Laws made in its favour by the Authority of the Nation, that have granted to theſe *Anabaptiſts* Indulgence, Liberty, and Protection. Therefore Separation from our Church, ſo well approved of by the unanimous Conſent of ſo many Wiſe, Pious, and Learned Legiſlators, fully as underſtanding as a few Mechanick Pedlars, Tinkers, Coblers, *&c.* of the *Anabaptiſts*, is a Contempt put upon their Judgment and Prudence, and

a Reflection upon their Piety and Wiſdom, and an Act of Ungratitude. But I would have our Adverſaries know, that as our Church is agreeable with the Holy Oracles, in all theſe Conſtitutions, it is built and ſettled upon Chriſt, the Chief Corner-ſtone, and is a true Chriſtian Church, conformable to the Primitive Patterns. Therefore to leave ſuch a Church is Apoſtacy from Chriſt, the Lord and Governor of it.

The *Second* Cauſe of his Separation is as childiſh as the firſt, 'tis *Becauſe the preſent Church of* England *is a National Church, divided into Provincial, Dioceſan and Parochial, which ſort of Churches we find nothing of in Scripture.* Is this a ſufficient cauſe of Separation, becauſe for the more orderly Government of Chriſt's Church amongſt us, and for the more convenient Inſtruction of our People, time out of Mind, our King's and Parliaments, God's Vice-Gerents, have eſtabliſh'd that Method? Is there any thing in this Conſtitution contrary to the Honour of God, or to any expreſs Text of Holy Scripture, or to the Salvation of Men? In ſuch Caſes does not God command our Obedience and Compliance with the lawful Orders of our Superiors, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. *Submit your ſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake.* The Chriſtian Magiſtrate is appointed by God over us, to preſerve the publick Peace and Decorum, as well in the Church, as in the State. Diſobedience in this Caſe is

a

Rebellion againſt God, *Rom.* 13. 2.

What he ſaith next, is both ridiculous and contrary to Holy Scripture, that we *Cannot perceive, that our Saviour intended that his Goſpel Church ſhould be national.* Did not Chriſt command his Apoſtles to go and Preach the Goſpel to all Nations, and Baptize them into his Holy Profeſſion? And when a whole Nation was converted, did not they unite into a National Church, by the Direction of the Spirit of God? Did they fall in pieces into divers Modes and Forms of Worſhip? or rather, Did they not all agree into one Method of divine Service? Which is the moſt commendable, and the moſt agreeable with Chriſtianity, and with the Intent and Deſign of Chriſt in our Redemption; Union and Unity; Order and Conformity; or Diviſion and Separation, into divers Congregations, Forms and Methods? Are not the Churches of Chriſt beyond the Seas *National?* Is it peculiar to our Church to be ſo? He quarrels with the General and Univerſal Conſtitution of all Foreign and Chriſtian Churches, that are National, where the Members are not ſuffer'd to vary nor diſſent from the preſcribed Orders. The Reaſons that he gives againſt a *National Goſpel Church*, are weak and impertinent; *Becauſe Chriſt would have begun to build it in that Form himſelf.* Chriſt, during his abode on Earth, held Communion with the *Jewiſh National* Church; therefore was no Enemy to that Con-

Conſtitution. And tho' he did not himſe
build his Church in that Form amongſt th
Gentiles, his Apoſtles and their Succeſſor
have appointed that Method; for we rea
of the converted Kingdoms, that agreed int
a *National Church*, and a *National* Form o
Worſhip. Again, he ſaith, We canno
think Chriſt's Goſpel Church to be *National*
*Becauſe he ſignifies his Doctrine would be oppo-
ſed with Fire and Sword*, &c. *becauſe if it were
ſo, it muſt expect to be freed from Perſecution
before Chriſt come; becauſe ſhe muſt in ſuch a Caſe
have Laws made to eſtabliſh her, becauſe none are
to be admitted Members of the Goſpel Church
but ſuch as manifeſt ſome Signs of being regene-
rate, and born again*, &c. p. 105. From theſe
erroneous, weak, and falſe Suppoſitions, thi
friendly Apoſtle of the *Anabaptiſts*, con-
cludes the Church of *England*, is not the true
Church of Chriſt.

The *Third* Cauſe of his Friendly Separation
is, *Becauſe they cannot be aſſur'd by any means,
that the Church of* England *hath true Baptiſm;
and where this is wanting, there can be no true
Church.* To this Exception I have ſufficiently
anſwer'd, That we have a true Baptiſm ac-
cording to Chriſt's Inſtitution; That both
the Subject and the Mode, are agreeable with
the *Holy Scriptures*, with the Practice of all
the Churches of Chriſt of all Ages and
Nations; That our Adminiſtration is per-
form'd by the Lawful Miniſters of Chriſt, to
which the *Anabaptiſts* cannot juſtly pretend.

ſhall only add a Word in relation to a ſup-poſed Letter of Dr. *Barlow* to Mr. *Tombs*, where the Language is ſo like that of an *Anabaptiſt*, that either Dr. *Barlow* was lean-ing to that Perſwaſion when he writ it, or the Letter is falſe and ſuppoſititious: The firſt may be gather'd from his ſayings, *That he was a Friend to the main of his Opinion*; *That he had not yet ſeen any thing like an Argument for Infant-Baptiſm*; *and, That there is neither Precept nor Practice in Scripture for it*, &c. 'Tis ſtrange, that Dr. *Barlow* never underſtood the expreſs Command of Chriſt to bring Infants to him, and into his Church and Covenant by Baptiſm. That he never read of *Origen*'s Teſtimony for Infant-Baptiſm, before the Two Hundred Years after Chriſt were elapſed, and before *Tertullian*'s days. 'Tis ſtrange, that he ſhould deſpiſe ſuch con-vincing Arguments for this Obſervation of Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Baxter*, as are to be read in their Books. 'Tis likewiſe very ſtrange, that he ſhould declare ſo expreſly againſt the Articles and Belief of the Church of *England*, whereof he then profeſſed him-ſelf a Member, and ſince was a *Biſhop*; amongſt which Articles are theſe Words, that *Baptiſm of Children is to be retain'd in the Church, as moſt agreeable with Chriſt's Inſtitu-tion.* Is it not ſtrange, that ſo learned a Man ſhould tell us, that St. *Auſtine* was the firſt for the neceſſity of Infant-Baptiſm, whereas *Cyprian*, and all the Fathers before him,

him, urg'd and preach'd the neceſſity, i
caſe of apparent Death. For Dr. *Taylor*'
favouring of their Doctrine, I find many o
this Sect cite him and his Arguments, whic
he daſhes out with one Stroke of his Pen, b
ſaying, *That for his part, he believes Infan*
Baptiſm to be a Truth, ſee *The Juſtif. In*
Baptiſm, Printed 1652. And he repente
to have given the Enemy by his Wit an
Reaſoning, ſo great an Advantage again
this Goſpel Truth, and the Right of Infant
But if an Angel from Heaven, ſhould ſpea
againſt our plain *Scripture-Proof* for Infan
Baptiſm, we are warranted by St. *Paul* t
reject him as accurſed, *Gal.* 1. 9. Fro
thence, and from the Uſage of all Church
and Ages, I have ſufficiently proved, Th
Infants are to be Baptized, and that Sprin
ling of Water is a Lawful and Evangeli
Baptiſm. Therefore what *Jo. Hooke* teac
eth, tho' an Apoſtle, for Adult-Baptiſm, a
Dipping to be eſſential, is already a
ſwer'd and evidenced to be erroneous a
falſe.

The *Fourth* Cauſe of his friendly Separ
tion, *We cannot find ſuch Officers in God's Wo*
as we find in that Church, Lord-Primates, Arc
biſhops, Lord-Biſhops, Provincial-Biſhops, D
ceſan-Biſhops, Arch-Deacons, &c. Were the
any thing in the Function of theſe Offic
contrary to the Word of God, it might a
miniſter cauſe of Exception againſt the
but as ſome of theſe Titles have been b
ſto

ow'd upon them, with their Revenues, by he Liberality of Princes, to diſtinguiſh heir Order, Dignity, and Pre-eminence in e Church, 'tis a very frivolous Reaſon, eerly for their Title ſake, not met with in cripture, to fall off from an Orthodox hurch, whereof they are Members and ignitaries. Our *Apologiſt* is ſo great a Friend them, that he judges, that by Humane *uthority*, *they may lawfully be diſplaced and ſhier'd*, as they were by the Violence of the ctors, in our late Civil War; for which, their firſt Confeſſion of Faith, the *Anabaptiſts* pplauded them.

The *Fifth* Cauſe of Separation is, That the hurch of *England* teaches, *That ſuch Infants e regenerate that are Baptized, which they n never believe*, &c. Now if the Baptiſm of r Church be a Lawful Baptiſm, according Chriſt's Inſtitution, as I have proved it to , and Infants are thereby, by his Command, ter'd into a New State, a State of Grace d Salvation, they may be ſaid to be rege- rated or born again of Water, and we aritably believe, of the Spirit too. There- re *J. H.* rejects not only the Doctrine of e Church of *England*, but alſo of the Holy criptures, that poſitively affirm, That they e baptized *for the Remiſſion of Sin*, and to e enter'd into Covenant with God, which is e Regeneration underſtood by our Church, *cts* 2. 38. *John* 3. 5.

The

The *Sixth* Cauſe of Separation is, *O ſtrange Forms of Worſhip, and multitude Ceremonies, which, he ſaith, they cannot find the Goſpel.* I anſwer: What ſeeems ſtran to a Proud Self-conceited Schiſmatick, appea not ſo to an Humble and Devout Chriſtia that can ſubmit to, and be benefited by o Religious Forms of Worſhip; and both the and the reaſonable Ceremonies enjoyn'd b our Church, are for Decency, Uniformi according to the Scripture Rules, and Edification of Souls, and the Honour a Worſhip of God. For the bowing to t Altar, is a falſe Notion, for Men bow on towards the Altar; 'tis no where commande tho' practiſed by ſome with a good Intent And towards the *Eaſt*, he compares it the Idolatry of thoſe who worſhip'd the S towards the *Eaſt*, *Ezek.* 8. 16. which no of our Church is guilty of: Here *J.* ſlanders our People. The ſecond childi Exception is, the Ring in Marriage, whic he ſaith, is uſed in the Name of the Ho Trinity; but he there miſtakes our Rubric for by that Ceremony the Woman is wedde to the Man, and endowed with all his Good in the Name of the Father, *&c.* Anoth Scare-crow that frights *J. H.* from us, is t Ancient, Significant and Primitive Sign the Croſs, which I have already vindicated my firſt *Antidote.*

The *Laſt* Reaſon of Separation is, T great want of Diſcipline in the Church *Englan*

ngland, which indeed is more exactly njoyn'd by our Canons, than practiſed by e Officers. But in this Accuſation *J. H.* ts as the proud *Phariſee* of the Goſpel, ho extoll'd the Purity and Devout Performnces of himſelf and Order, but deſpiſed the nful *Publican*. It were to be wiſh'd, that l Chriſtian Profeſſors were Saints; but we nnot expect it, while Satan hath ſo great a iberty in the World, to ſow Tares in the ord's Field. The Time of exact Diſcipline d Separation is at the End of the World, *Matth.* 13. 39, 40. At preſent we muſt nitate our Lord, who admitted into his ompany, and aſſociated with Publicans, nners, Scribes, and Phariſees. To ſeparate om a Church only becauſe of ungodly embers in it, is an Act of a proud, conited, phariſaical Spirit, not juſtifiable before od or Men. But if we inquire into their ure and holy Congregations, we ſhall meet ith ſome as fully debauch'd and villainous as y can be. What Reaſon have they to ory in their Diſcipline and Sanctity of their rofeſſors, while we can produce amongſt n Drunkenneſs, Whoredom, and Polygamy, d other notorious Crimes, masked under Appearance of Holineſs, whereof their ted Teachers are guilty: For Inſtance, one ——— *Alc—ck* a late Teacher at *Deptford*, ve the Pox to his Maid, as ſhe confeſſed to Doctor of Phyſick before her Death. nother heavenly Preacher, one *W. Ra—l—ns*

a

a Baker of *Bury*, hath Two Wives, *&c.* could prove a Hundred more such Practic amongst them. Now suppose some of the Exceptions were real, Are they sufficient t justify before God, his and his Brethren Apostacy from a Church of Christ, where th Word of God is purely preach'd, and th Sacraments duly administred according t Christ's Institution; where nothing is enjoyn but what is innocent, harmless, just, orthodo and good, tending to the Glory of God, an the Salvation and Comfort of Souls? Ther fore the Separation of the *Anabaptists* is u reasonable, unwarrantable, and contrary t these Texts of *Holy Scripture*, Rom. 12. 1 and 15. 6. 2 *Cor.* 13. 11. *Phil.* 1. 2 *Gal.* 5. 20. *Eph.* 4. 3. *Rom.* 16. 17. 1 *C* 1. 3, 11. If there were any thing practis or appointed in our Church, that migh render the Professors in Communion with i Criminals before God, there might be Reason for a Breach of Unity; but we den any such Practice to be amongst us. L therefore the Reader judge, upon what fr volous, childish, and foolish Accounts, the Men divide from our Church: And let the consider, whether these Causes, as they pr tend for a Separation from us, will be allowe as sufficient at the last Tribunal, before a Impartial Judge; when their bare Thought their mistaken Consciences, and frivolo Exceptions, will not pass for lawful Plea when they might have been better informe fro

from God's Holy Word; and when their hainous Crimes of Apoſtacy, and their adhering to the Spirit of Error, which have drawn after them many diſmal Conſequences, ſhall be charg'd upon them; when the Damnation of ſo many miſerable Souls, that by theſe Diviſions and Hereſies have fallen into the Devil's Snares, and are ruin'd for all Eternity, ſhall be requir'd at their Hands; and when all their Lying and Forgery, with which they ſupport their Party and Errors, ſhall be detected, and appear without diſguiſe or mask before Men and Angels.

Mr. Ben.

Mr. Ben. Keach's Rector Rectified, o *Book againſt Infant-Baptiſm, brieſ tried by the Word of God and Reaſon and proved to be falſe and erroneous.*

I Find in this Gentleman, the ſame bold inſolent, preſumptuous, falſe, and deceit ful Spirit, diſcoverable all over his Book, wit this difference between Mr. *Hooke* and him that this Spirit is bare fac'd, but the othe appears mask'd with a Vizard of Friendſhip 'Twas written in Oppoſition to a Reveren Divine of our Church Mr. *William Burke* Rector of *Mildin* in *Suffolk*, and his Argu ments for Infant-Baptiſm. He ſeems to tri umph and glory in his Perſwaſion, grounde upon theſe falſe Suppoſitions, *That there is n Precept in the Word of God for Infant-Baptiſm nor Example for ſuch a Practice*; *That Baptiſ is rightly to be adminiſtred only by Dipping*, a *not by Sprinkling*, &c. Theſe and othe groundleſs and unreaſonable Suppoſitions h often repeats, and takes for granted; but a I have already proved the contrary, I ſha examine ſome other of his Miſtakes, to con firm my former Arguments for Infant Baptiſm, and our Mode of Adminiſtration

He ſaith *p.* 2. *I deny that Baptiſm is an where in God's Word call'd a Seal of th Covenant of Grace*, &c. Tho' it be not ſ call'd there, the Intent and Purpoſe of it

Inſtitu

Inſtitution by Chriſt, is to be a viſible and outward Seal of our Profeſſion, and of our Chriſtianity, and a Seal from God, by the Hand and Mouth of his Miniſter, of our Reception into his Church and Covenant. As it is appointed by Chriſt, to be inſtead of Circumciſion, and as that was a Sign and a Seal to *Abraham* of God's Favour, and of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, Baptiſm being deſign'd for the ſame Purpoſe, viſibly to enter us into Covenant with God, 'tis conſequently both a Sign and Seal, and as our Catechiſm expreſſes: *A Pledge to aſſure us thereof*, Rom. 4. 11. Therefore to correct his Miſtake, Baptiſm of Water is an outward Seal not of inward Grace, but of the Promiſes of God annex'd to this Ordinance, and of outward Covenant Bleſſings, the inward being ſealed into us by the Baptiſm of the Spirit.

He denies, *p.* 4. that Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion, contrary to the expreſs Words of Chriſt, *Go and Diſciple all Nations*, Baptizing or by Baptiſm, *&c.* As during the *Moſaick* Covenant, Men and Infants were diſcipled, or proſelyted by Circumciſion; ſo *Matth.* 28. 19. by the Command of our Lord they are now to be proſelyted by Baptiſm, and enter'd into his Church by that outward Ceremony, *Acts* 2. 41. The Reaſons that he muſters up to contradict, are frivolous, impertinent, and ſome falſe, as *That Baptiſm is a Sign of the Peculiar Spiritual Privileges made to Saints, as ſuch, and no others.*

By the Command of Chriſt it belongs to all his outward Diſciples, *Matth.* 28. to all that profeſs their Belief, *Mark* 16. 16. to all ſuch as are to come to him, *Luke* 18. 16. as we have ſufficiently proved. 'Tis a Sign of our Admiſſion into Chriſt's Church, where all are not Saints, but a mixed Multitude. He reckons up the Differences between Circumciſion and Baptiſm to little purpoſe, for he confeſſeth, *p.* 6. *That Circumciſion was anciently the initiating Ordinance, and Baptiſm is ſo now in Goſpel Times,* &c. Here he contradicts himſelf, and what he hath formerly ſaid; for after he had ſpent his Wit, to prove that Baptiſm ſucceeds not in the room of Circumciſion, he acknowledges it does, for the chief Purpoſe we alledge it, namely, To be an Initiating Ordinance into the Chriſtian Church, as that was into the *Jewiſh.* And he furniſhes us with an Argument againſt his Perſwaſion; for thoſe who had a Right to be then initiated into the Covenant by God's expreſs and poſitive Command, without a Repeal, have a Right ſtill; but young Infants of Believing Parents had then ſuch a Right, which was never repealed: Therefore they have a Right ſtill to be enter'd into God's Covenant, and to the Promiſe that was then made to *Abraham* and his Seed, as 'tis underſtood by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 8. *They which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God; but the children of the promiſe are counted for the Seed.* So *Gal.* 3. 16.

16. *The Promiſes were made to Abraham and to his Seed, which is Chriſt.* In him therefore Chriſtian Children have a Title and Claim to this Promiſe, and conſequently to the Covenant unto which 'tis annex'd. There needs no other Declaration of the Will of God in this Caſe; but if our Adverſaries require a poſitive Command to bring our Children into Covenant, we can produce Chriſt's expreſs Orders: *To ſuffer little children to come unto him*, &c. and the Reaſon, becauſe *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Now the Kingdom of God can belong to none but to thoſe within the Covenant, who are in Chriſt.

He tells us next, *p.* 11. *That Baptiſm and Circumciſion were both in force together.* I confeſs the Baptiſm of *John* was, but not that of *Chriſt.* And he falſly ſaith, *p.* 17. *That the* New Teſtament *is wholly ſilent in the Caſe of Infant-Baptiſm, and Church-Membership*; but I have proved and evidenc'd the contrary. 'Tis plain and intelligible to us, tho' not to the wilfully blind *Anabaptiſts*, in the Eight Arguments before mention'd, drawn from Holy Scripture, That in the Goſpel 'tis Chriſt's expreſs Command, that Infants of Believing Parents ſhould be enter'd into his Church and Kingdom by Baptiſm, as the Children of *Abraham* were enter'd into Covenant with God by Circumciſion. We borrow not therefore our Children's Baptiſm from the *Jewiſh* Practice, of Baptizing all Children of their Proſelytes, as he would have the

World believe, and 'tis to be proved they did, but from Chriſt's Inſtitution and poſitive Order, ſo often repeated. And I would have our Adverſaries know, that the Differences between the Goſpel Covenant and the *Jewiſh*, do not in any reſpect incapacitate our Infants from an Entrance into a Covenant with God, as the former were. Therefore all Mr. *Keach*'s arguing, and long diſcourſe, to invalidate the Argument drawn from Infant Circumciſion, to prove our Infant-Baptiſm, is frivolous and vain; for if the Mercy and Goodneſs of God to our Infants are the ſame, and as inclinable to do them good, as to the Children of *Abraham*; and if they are as capable of Covenanting with God as the former, and as fit for the receiving what Bleſſings their Redeemer is pleaſed to beſtow upon them, all other Differences between the Legal and Evangelick Covenants are inſignificant, and no Impediments to their Reception by Baptiſm.

Why Chriſt made ſo little mention of the Enrolling Infants into his Covenant by his New Sign and Seal, Mr. *Burket* ſaith very well, that it was the indiſputable Practice amongſt God's People then, to admit them by Circumciſion, and there was no need to declare his Mind in this Caſe in relation to them, more plainly than he had done before, when he order'd, *To ſuffer little Children to come to him*, &c. To which *B. K.* returns

Four

Four impertinent Anſwers: *Firſt*, Our Saviour knew that Infant-Baptiſm would be denied; If he would have had it practiſed in his Church, he would have Commanded it in expreſs Terms. What a weak and unſettled reaſoning is this, which may be turned either way as a Weathercock? For we may as well ſay, becauſe he knew it would be diſputed to prevent Controverſies, if he would not have had Infant Baptiſm in his Church, he would have forbidden it; and there is a greater probability for our Reaſoning than for that of *B. K*'s, becauſe it was then the conſtant Uſage of God's Church, to admit innocent Babes of Believers into covenant with God, and grant them the Seal. It was therefore likely that he would have prohibited it, if he had diſliked it, and there was then a greater need for a Prohibition and Repeal of that Right, Infants then enjoy'd without controul, than for a Command to continue the Uſage, which none denied them at that Time. 2dly, *Why ſhould the Baptizing of Believers be ſo clearly ſpoken of in the* New Teſtament, *if a being in the Covenant was a ſufficient ground to baptize them without a poſitive Precept?* And why was not the ſame mention'd in reſpect of Infants? I anſwer, *B. K.* is in a great Error. Neither Believers nor Infants are within the Covenant, till they be enter'd by Chriſt's and God's initiating Ordinance; and that there was no Precept for Baptizing Infants, as well

as the Adult Believers, I have proved it a notorious Untruth. But when the Apostles received a Command from their Master, to go and preach the Gospel to all Nations, it was needful to declare to them upon what Terms they were to be admitted into his Church and Kingdom, and receive the Badge of Admission. 3*dly*, He insists next upon the Difference of the Church of the *Jews* which, he says, was National; but that of the Gospel, Congregational. This last Position is false, and cunningly insinuated by *B. K.* and his Brethren, to make the World believe, that their Independant and Irregular Congregations are establish'd according to Christ's Model. Therefore he argues upon the changing the State of the Church, the Gospel Dispensation requir'd a positive Command to baptize Infants, which we judge we have in Christ's fore-mention'd Invitation and Order. 4thly, *That Christ, by establishing a New Covenant, dissolved the Old, with all the Rites*, &c. But whatever he dissolved, he did not come to dissolve or disanul the Priviledges of his People; but to grant them greater and larger: Therefore Infants were not to be deprived of those Blessings they enjoy'd before his coming. What he saith next to the second Chapter, depends upon this false Position, That Christ never express'd his Mind in the *New Testament*, that Infants should be Baptized; but I have proved the contrary. I meet here so many Errors in Divinity, so many

many Miſtakes and Miſ-interpretations of Holy Scripture, that I cannot number them all. He ſuppoſes that the Baptiſm of *John*, which I have already obſerved to belong, and proper only to Adult Perſons, was the ſame with that of Chriſt; which is falſe, as may be proved from *Acts* 19. 4, 5. The Baptiſm of *John*, was no Introduction into God's Covenant, but a Paſſage from the *Jewiſh* State into an Evangelick; neither was it adminiſtred in the Name of the *Father, of the Son*, &c. as Chriſt's is. The Doctrine of the Trinity, tho' revealed obſcurely in the *Old Teſtament*, and known to the Learned, was more clearly diſcover'd in the *New*, and plainly manifeſted, by the Dedication of our Perſons and Children, to the Honour and Service of the Father, of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

He ſaith, *p.* 39. that Mr. *Burket* is miſtaken, when he calls Circumciſion a Seal of the Covenant made with *Abraham*; whereas 'tis ſo underſtood by God, at the firſt Inſtitution, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. *This is my covenant, which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee. Every male child among you, ſhall be circumciſed*, &c. *And it ſhall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* How is it a Covenant? 'Tis only the Sign, Seal, and Token of it. Thus he denies that Baptiſm is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, under the Goſpel. By this it plainly appears, that *B. K.* underſtood not the Nature and Cir-

cumſtances of the Goſpel Covenant, whereof the Baptiſm of Water is an outward and viſible Seal and Pledge, by virtue of Chriſt's Inſtitution and Promiſe. He tells us, *p.* 4. *That the Covenant made with* Abraham *was a mix'd Covenant, that reſpected both the Natural and Spiritual Children.* But he denies, *p.* 43. *That the Contract made with* Abraham, *was made with the Natural Seed of Believing Gentiles.* I anſwer, If God promiſed to be the God of *Abraham*, becauſe of his Faith, Believing *Gentiles* and their Seed, may juſtly claim the ſame Right to this Promiſe, by reaſon of their Belief and Covenant with him in Chriſt, who is the true Seed of *Abraham* intended in that Promiſe, as St. *Paul* affirms, *Gal.* 3. 16. Therefore that Promiſe made to *Abraham*, was an Evangelick Promiſe, wherein all that are related to Chriſt, and are true Believers, are in the ſame Condition as *Abraham* was; and their Seed have an equal Right to God's Favour and Spiritual Mercies. Why they ſhould be deprived of them, our Adverſaries could never give any Reaſon; or why they ſhould not be admitted into Covenant with God. *B. K.* propoſes an unproper Example, of a Man making Two Wills, as God Two Covenants; and that unleſs a Legacy be expreſſed in the laſt Will, it being mention'd in the firſt, is not recoverable by Law. The Compariſon is not equal, for God hath not alter'd his Will, as to the Favour and Bleſſings granted to the Faithful

and

and their Children, under the Goſpel, who are not abridg'd or deprived of them that were formerly enjoyed ; God is an unchangeable Being, and unchangeable in his Promiſes and Favours to Men, till they forfeit them. But I cannot but take notice here, how *B. K.* as the reſt of his Sect, labours to confound the Queſtions, and perplex the cleareſt Truths with intricate Notions, and far-fetch'd Diſtinctions, and generally they diſcourſe of Divine Matters as blind Men of Colours, by hear-ſay. He labours to prove that the Seed of Believing *Gentiles*, are not concern'd in that Promiſe made to *Abraham : I will be the God of thee, and of thy Seed after thee.* Whereas they are in the ſame Capacity as *Abraham*'s Natural Seed, Children of Believers, as *Abraham* was, and in Chriſt their Head and Founder ; they may be call'd the Spiritual Seed, deſcended from Perſons in covenant with God ; and why he ſhould not be their God, as well as he was of *Abraham*'s Seed, for the ſame Reaſon of their Father's Faith, none can tell. Now this Expreſſion neceſſarily requires their admittance into covenant with him, and conſequently to the Seal of it, which, under the Goſpel, is Baptiſm, as Circumciſion was formerly. As God required the Seal of Circumciſion to be applied to Infants with this grievous Penalty, in caſe of Omiſſion, to be cut off from their People ; ſo he requires Baptiſm by the ſame Law that is in force as to us now, in relation

to this Adminiſtration: Therefore there is no abſurdity to ſay, that 'tis in the Power of Men, to bring their Children into covenant with God, or into the ordinary and appointed Way or Method of Salvation. God may ſave them without; but we have no Promiſe that he will. He requires our Compliance and Obedience to his Divine Inſtitutions, unto which his Promiſes and Bleſſings are annexed. But of this I have already ſpoken ſo fully, that I purpoſely omit an Anſwer to all Mr. *K*'s weak Arguments, and frivolous Exceptions, with which he labours to prove our Children have no Right to be enter'd into covenant with God under the Goſpel, tho' Chriſt hath declared the contrary, by ſaying, *That of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, and that they are to be brought, and to come to him, to be enter'd into that Bleſſed Kingdom and Society. To all the reſt of his Book I have given already a ſufficient Anſwer elſewhere, in the foregoing Pages. I ſhall only examin his Objection to Chriſt's Invitation and Command, *To ſuffer little Children to come unto him, for of ſuch*, &c. *B. K.* ſaith, that during Chriſt's Abode on Earth, there were other ordinary Ways of coming to him, than by Admiſſion into his Church. What is this to the Invitation of Infants to come to him? I have already obſerv'd, that Chriſt was departing out of the World; That theſe Infants were *Jewiſh* Infants, within the Covenant by Circumciſion; That they had

no

on other way, after our Saviour's Death, to come to him, but by Baptiſm; and, That he left this as a ſtanding Order to his Miniſters, *To ſuffer little Children, ſuch little Children* of Believing Parents, to come to him, and adds the Reaſon, *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; That they were fit in that tender Age, to become Subjects of his Bleſſed Kingdom. But before they could be reckon'd or admitted to that Honour and Privilege, they were to come to him, which ſince his Departure they cannot do by any other Way, but by Baptiſm. 'Tis true, Chriſt might own theſe *Jewiſh* Children, who had been Circumciſed Subjects of his Kingdom; but Children in the State of Nature, polluted with Original Sin, cannot be reckon'd Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom, till they be brought to the Initiating Ordinance of Baptiſm, to that Laver of Regeneration. If he did not Baptize theſe, 'twas becauſe Baptiſm, as I have already ſaid, I mean the Baptiſm of Chriſt, was not a ſtanding Ordinance in his Church, till after his Reſurrection. Therefore the major of *B. K*'s Argument is falſe, and we utterly deny it. *If Children were brought to Chriſt, and he did not baptize them, then we muſt not.* For the Time of Chriſt's Baptiſm was to begin, when he had by his Death put an End to the Rites of the Levitical Law, and eſtabliſh'd a New Church and Kingdom, by his Glorious Reſurrection.

Then

Then Circumcision was to cease, and Christ's Baptism to take place; Then Children and Infants were to come to him to be Subjects of his Kingdom, which they cannot be, unless they be initiated by Baptism. To all his other Reasonings I have fully answer'd, and why we don't admit Infants to the Lord's Supper, I have spoken sufficiently.

Of

Of the Chriſtian Sabbath *appointed by Chriſt, and obſerved by his Holy* Apoſtles, *and ſince by the Church of God in all Ages.*

THe Reaſon of my examining this Controverſy next, about the *Chriſtian* and *Jewiſh Sabbath*, is the Kindneſs that I have for my Adverſary, whom I underſtand to be a *Jewiſh Sabbatarian*, or a *Seventh-day-Baptiſt*, as I am inform'd. I am very willing to cure his Judgment of that Error, as well as of the former, if it be poſſible; and as there are a number of others infected with that Perſwaſion, my Reaſons for our Chriſtian Practice, may not be unuſeful to them of the ſame Sect. Now 'tis expreſly declared in the Confeſſion of the *Anabaptiſts*, Ch. 22. N. 7. *As it is the Law of Nature, that in general a Proportion of Time by God's appointment be ſet a-part for the Worſhip of God, ſo by his Word, in a poſitive, moral, and perpetual Commandment, binding all Men in all Ages, he hath particularly appointed One Day in Seven for a* Sabbath, *to be kept holy unto him, which from the Beginning of the World to the Reſurrection of Chriſt, was the laſt Day of the Week; and from the Reſurrection of Chriſt, was changed into the firſt Day of the Week, which is called the* Lord's-day; *and is to be continued to the End of the World, as the* Chriſtian Sabbath; *the obſervation of the laſt*

Day

Day of the Week being aboliſhed. This Article is agreeable with our Church's Doctrine and Practice. If all the *Anabaptiſts* were of this Perſwaſion, there needed no Arguments to be uſed in this Matter; but theſe Men who have forſaken our Church, are now divided amongſt themſelves in this Point; for ſome of them ſtiffly maintain that the *Jewiſh Sabbath* is yet to be kept, and God's Command in force in relation to the *Seventh-day*. Againſt theſe my purpoſe is to examine and reſolve theſe Three Queſtions by Holy *Scripture* and *Reaſon*.

Firſt, Whether *Chriſtian Profeſſors* are now obliged by any Natural Law or Precept, to obſerve the *Seventh-day* of the Creation?

Secondly, Whether that Day be not changed by a Divine Authority into the *Chriſtian Sabbath?*

Thirdly, What Obligations we have religiouſly to keep that Day, in Commemoration of the Reſurrection of our Glorious Redeemer?

Reaſon and the Law of Nature teach us to Adore and Worſhip a Superior Being, upon whom we depend, and from whom we daily receive our Life and Subſiſtance, and to offer to him a Part of our Enjoyments, as an acknowledgment, that all proceeds from him, who is the Giver of every good Gift. The ſame Law directs us to ſet a-part ſome part of our Time for this Worſhip, to ſolemnize

it,

it, and perform it with more reſpect, and in a manner more becoming the Glory and Majeſty of our God. All civilized Nations have had their ſet Times of Adoration of their Gods, and *Plutarch* ſpeaks, that amongſt the *Grecians* and *Romans* the *Seventh-day* was obſerv'd. It ſeems they were not ignorant of that Day, that God had choſen at the Creation of the World, to ſanctify it, and 'tis probable that this was a Tradition derived to them from former Generations, with which they were acquainted. *Moſes* has left upon Record God's firſt Decree concerning the Seventh-days's Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. 2, 3. *And on the ſeventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he reſted on the ſeventh day from all his work which he had made, and God bleſſed the ſeventh day, and ſanctified it, becauſe that in it he had reſted from all his work which God created and made.* It ſeems by theſe Words, that God fixed and appointed the Devotions of Men, that is, the ſolemn Worſhip of him to this certain Day, that was the Concluſion of the Creation. And accordingly, when Men began to multiply upon the Earth, and *Enos* the Son of *Seth* was born, Men *began to call upon the name of the Lord*; that is, to aſſemble and unite in a Congregation, and publickly to praiſe and glorify God, which was probably on this Seventh Day, *Gen.* 4. 26. Therefore ſince God had choſen that Day, by ſetting it a-part, and by a particular Bleſſing had ſanctified it above

all

all other Days, 'twas the Duty of all true Servants of God at that Time, and in the following Ages, to conform themſelves to the Holy Example of their Creator, and not to vary from it without his Warrant. For that reaſon we find this Day confirm'd by God in the *Moral Law*, and he ſpeaks of it, as of a *Day* well known to the *Iſraelites* with an Emphatick *Memento*, *Remember that thou keep holy the ſabbath day*, &c. Four Reaſons are in this Command, to enforce it, and oblige his People to the obſervation of that particular Day: *Firſt*, God's Command to the Men of that Time to take notice of it, and free it from Oblivion. *2dly*, Becauſe 'tis the *Sabbath* of the Lord our God. *A Day* that he had ſet a-part and choſen for the Celebration of his Praiſe and Worſhip; *a Day*, that he claim'd, and had appropriated to himſelf amongſt all other Days, as his *Day*; and the rather Men ought to yield that Day to God, becauſe of his liberal allowance of Six Days, granted to them for their neceſſary Occupations. *3dly*, Becauſe he had finiſhed his glorious Works of Creation, and reſted on that Day. Therefore to ſolemnize the Memory of the compleating of ſo noble a Fabrick, and of God's fetching it and Mankind out of the dark *Abyſs* and *Chaos*, they could do no leſs than ſanctify that Day, in glorifying the Omnipotency and Goodneſs of God, who had given them a Being. *Laſtly*, Becauſe he had vouchſafed a Bleſſing to that Day;

Day, and had hallowed it, ſeparated it from the reſt and ordinary Occupations, and promiſed his Divine Benediction to the due obſervance of it. All theſe were reaſons ſufficient to oblige the Men of the firſt World and the next Ages, and under the *Moſaick Law*, to be diligent in keeping the *Seventh Day Holy*, and in dedicating it entirely to the Service of God. Therefore 'tis often named the *Lord's Sabbath*, and a Religious obſervation of it ſtrictly enjoyn'd by *Moſes* and the *Prophets*.

But in this Precept there is ſome part *Moral* and of a perpetual continuance in the Churches of God, and ſome part *Ceremonial* and *Typical*. The Moral part, to which we are all oblig'd, is the ſanctifying of *One Day* in Seven, and employ it in Acts of Religion and Charity, and in divine Meditations and Prayers. In that Day we are to reſt from our daily works, allow likewiſe a Reſt to our Servants and Cattle, that they may reap the benefit of this Ceſſation from Labour, granted to them by the Divine appointment. The *Ceremonial* part conſiſts in an over ſtrict obſervation of the *Seventh Day*, enjoyned by *Moſes* to the Children of *Iſrael*, with that ſeverity, that the gathering of a few Sticks was Puniſh'd with Stoning to Death; and nothing was to be done that might diſturb their Reſt. The *Typical* part was to repreſent by that extraordinary Repoſe of that Day, the Glorious Reſt that we ſhould enjoy under

under the Dominion and Empire of th
Meſſiah: Therefore the *Seventh Day* of th
Jews was both *Ceremonial* and *Typical*. An
as all Levitical *Types* were no longer to con
tinue, but till the *Death* and *Reſurrection* o
the Meſſiah; This amongſt the other Type
had then an end, and God's Command was n
longer binding to us Chriſtians, for th
keeping the *Jewiſh Sabbath*. And this
prove,

Firſt, Becauſe, tho' God from the beginnin
had Sanctified that day in remembrance o
the Creation, he never Commanded the ob
ſervation of it but to his People, the Poſte
rity of *Abraham*, that they might atten
upon their Sacrifices, Burnt-Offerings, an
other Acts of Religion, all which are no
totally aboliſh'd, and therefore the da
deſign'd for that purpoſe ceaſeth, to giv
place to another.

Secondly, St. *Paul* tells the *Coloſſ. c.* 2. *v.* 1
*That the Sabbath Days were a ſhadow of thing
to come; but the Body is of Chriſt.* Wha
need of the ſhadows, when we enjoy th
Subſtance? This Text proves that th
Jewiſh Sabbath being a *Typical* Repreſenta
tion of our Bleſſings under the Goſpel,
was to continue no longer than to the Deat
of Chriſt, who *is the end of the Law*, Ro
10. 4. that is, of the *Levitical*, *Ceremonia*
and *Typical* Law. The *Seventh Day* being
part, the ſame the Apoſtle expreſly declare
Heb. 7. 12. That there is of neceſſity ma
a Chan

Change of that Law, becauſe the Prieſt-
ood was changed, therefore it is no longer
o be obſerved by us Chriſtians.

Thirdly, God not only allows ſix Days in
hat Commandment, to employ our ſelves
our neceſſary Works; but enjoyns us,
ix Days ſhalt thou Labour. If therefore, as
e ſhall prove next, The *Jewiſh Sabbath*
chang'd into the Chriſtian by the Or-
er of Chriſt and his Holy Apoſtles, and ſo
nderſtood by all the Churches ſince his Death
d Paſſion, we are no longer to keep that
ay, but Religiouſly to obſerve the Day of
r Saviour's Reſurrection. But had we no
ther Arguments and Proofs to bring for
r aboliſhing the *Jewiſh Sabbath* than what
e *Old Teſtament* affords, we ſhould find our
lves at a loſs; for there is nothing more
rictly enjoyn'd; no Precept more often re-
eated; nor none more frequently enforced
ith Promiſes and Threatnings than the *Ce-
bration* of that Day. We muſt therefore
quire from the *New Teſtament* how that
ay ſo ſolemnly enjoyn'd by God, comes to
alter'd; and by what Authority the Lord's
ay is ſubſtituted in its ſtead: For that
rpoſe we are to take notice that Chriſt
forms the *Jews*, Matth. 12. 8. *That the
n of Man was Lord even of the Sabbath Day*;
erefore he had a Power to continue, or to
ange it as he ſaw convenient. This is
e neceſſary conſequence of that Dominion,
hich he claims over that Primitive Ordi-
nance

nance of God. Now according to that A
thority, and all Power committed to him b
the Father, that he hath enjoyned the o
ſervation of the firſt Day of the Week
Memory of his Glorious Reſurrection, ma
appear by the Teſtimony of the Holy Scri
tures, and the practice of the Holy Apoſtle
who were met together on that Day Chri
appear'd to them, *John* 20. 19. And we fi
St. *Paul* and the Diſciples of *Troas* m
together on the firſt Day of the Wee
on the Chriſtian Sabbath, to break Brea
to Celebrate the Remembrance of the Dea
of Chriſt in the Communion, and this A
poſtle Preaching amongſt them, *Acts* 20.
This firſt day of the Week is expreſſed h
μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, the word ἡμέρᾳ is there
be underſtood. And the Day of our Sav
our's Reſurrection is expreſs'd in the ſam
Terms, *Mark* 16. 2. λίαν πρωὶ τ μιᾶς σαββάτ
which words are expounded in the firſt ver
of *Matthew* 28. *In the end of the Sabbath*
it began to dawn towards the firſt day of t
Week, &c. So Mark 16. *When the Sabba*
Day was paſt, and very early in the Morni
&c. 'Twas therefore the Cuſtom of t
Chriſtian and *Gentile* Churches to obſerve th
day in Acts of Devotion, as we may unde
ſtand from the 1 *Corinth.* c. 16. 2. On t
firſt Day of the Week, they were to aſſem
ble and make Collections of their Chari
for the Poor; now it may be queſtion'd wh
our Bleſſed wiſe Lord gave not an expre
orde

rder upon Record, for the Obſervation of his Day of the Reſurection; but left it to is Apoſtles management, and delivered to hem his Will by word of Mouth. It was ecauſe of the high Opinion the *Jews* had of heir *Sabbath Day*, and of their averſion to ny Change of that Day; therefore to give hem no diſtaſt nor prejudice againſt his Religion upon that account, Chriſt left it o the Prudence of his Apoſtles, to alter by degrees, and oblige the Converted *Gentiles* more eaſily to be perſwaded to the bſervation of this Day of his Reſurection, that by their example and practice, hey who believed amongſt the *Jews*, might in ime be induced to the ſame obſervation; for s the other Nations had no ſuch value for his Primitive and Levitical Law, they could nore eaſily be prevail'd upon than the *Jews*, o neglect it. Was not this the cauſe of hat Nations quarrel with the *Protomartyr* Steven, and the reaſon of their Accuſation? *We have heard him ſay, that this Jeſus of* Nazareth *ſhall Deſtroy this Place, and ſhall Change the Cuſtoms which* Moſes *deliver'd to us*, *Acts.* 6. 14. This was likewiſe the principal cauſe of their Hatred againſt, and Perſecution of St. *Paul*; becauſe he taught the *Chriſtian Gentiles* to obſerve the Day of Chriſt's Reſurrection inſtead of the former *Sabbath*, and forbid their Circumciſion, of which the believing *Jews* were very fond; Witneſs the Words of *James*, *Acts* 21. 20, 21. *Thou ſeeſt*,

ſeeſt Brother, how many Thouſands of Jew there are, which believe, and they are all zealous o the Law, and they are informed of thee, that tho teacheſt all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles to forſake Moſes, ſaying, That they ought not t Circumciſe their Children, neither to walk after th Cuſtoms. And amongſt theſe Cuſtoms was th obſervation of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*; therefor by the Doctrine and Practice of this Apoſtle it was chang'd into the Chriſtian, the firſ Day of the Week.

Secondly, This Day is expreſly named b St. *John*, *Revel.* 1. 10. *The Lord's Day*, The Day that our Redeemer Challenges to him- ſelf as his Day, in which he calls for our Devotions and Reſpects; a Day that we are never to forget, but always to Celebrate in remembrance of the diſcharge of our Surety from his Tomb; a Day of Praiſe and Thankſgiving, becauſe on that Day our Redemption was compleat, our Saviour releas'd out of the Priſons of Death; a Day, in one word, that open'd to us and diſcover'd to all believing Souls, a Proſpect and Aſſurance of a bleſſed Immortality, and a perfect Reconciliation with our God. On that Day, the Apoſtles were met together, and God approved from Heaven the Celebration of that Day by a Miraculous deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon Chriſt's Diſciples *Acts* 2. Such a Sanctification of it by the Gift of Tongues and other wonderful Bleſſings beſtowed upon thoſe Primitive

Chriſtian's

Chriſtian's, was ſufficient to recommend it to the obſervation of the Poſterity, and the Inſtitution of this day inſtead of the *Jewiſh Sabbath.*

Thirdly, The conſtant obſervation of this day from the Infancy of Chriſtian Religion, is no ſlight Argument that it was of a Divine Eſtabliſhment. All the Churches of the *Eaſt* and *Weſt* part of the World did always meet together and perform the Service of God on this Day, as may be proved by many paſſages out of the Fathers, and particularly out of *Ignatius*, who ſays, *Let every one that loveth Chriſt Celebrate the Lord's Day.* And *Euſebius*, *l.* 4. *c.* 25. tells us of *Melito*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, that he wrote a Treatiſe of the Lord's Day, when there was a contention at *Laodicea* raiſed by ſome *Judaizing Chriſtians* about the *Sabbath Day.* Few of the Ancient and Primitive Writers, when they have occaſion offer'd, but mention this day, as a day appointed for the ſolemn Aſſemblies of Chriſtians. The Heathens were ſo well acquainted with this Practice, that they would commonly Queſtion them with this ſaying, *What, you obſerve the Lord's Day?* To which the Chriſtian wou'd Anſwer, *I am a Chriſtian and cannot neglect it.* *Nazianzen* in the Funeral Oration at his Father's Death, ſpeaks of the obſervation of the Lord's Day amongſt all *Chriſtians* of that Time. And *Juſtin Martyr* declares expreſly, That the *Chriſtian Aſſemblies* were on *Sunday*,

Sunday, τῇ τῦ Ηλίυ ἡμέρᾳ ; and as *Tertullian* Interprets it, *Die Solis* ; Likewiſe *Athanaſius* in his Book of the *Sabbath* and *Circumciſion*, poſitively affirms the *Jewiſh Sabbath* to have been abrogated ; and in its ſtead the Day of the Reſurrection of Chriſt to have been eſtabliſhed for the Duties of Religion. To theſe Teſtimonies we may add the words of the Council of *Laodicea*, older than the *Nicene* mention'd by St. *Baſil*, and approved of by the Council of *Chalcedon*. In the 29th Canon 'tis ordered, *That Chriſtian Men may not Judaize, or grow Jews, in making the Saturday or Sabbath-day their Day of Reſt ; but they are to Work on that Day, giving their Honour of Celebration to the Lord's Day. And if any in this particular be found to Judaize ; let them be Anathema to God and Chriſt.* There can be no plainer Teſtimony than theſe to witneſs, that the Lord's Day Succeeded the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, and that as the latter was aboliſh'd, the former was Religiouſly kept by all that were named Orthodox Chriſtians. And altho' the *Apoſtles*, and particularly St. *Paul*, as we read in the *Acts*, went on the *Sabbath Day* to Preach to the *Jews* ; and the Converted *Chriſtians* kept Communion with their Brethren at *Jeruſalem*, by frequenting the Temple, the Publick Place of Worſhip, on the *Seventh Day*. This was practic'd for fear of giving offence to their Nation ; for to avoid all *Schiſm* and *Diviſion*, and to inſtruct them in the Doctrines of Chriſtianity

at

at their Solemn times and places of meetings in their *Synagogues*. But from hence we are not to conclude, The obſervation of the *Jewiſh Sabbath* is to be yet continu'd amongſt us *Chriſtians*; for we have not the ſame Reaſons as they had to comply with their miſtakes and weakneſs in this Caſe, for fear of offence, and for the Converſion of any to our Religion: But on the contrary, the keeping of the *Jewiſh Sabbath* gives a Scandal to the Weak *Chriſtians* amongſt us, and is diſgraceful to our Profeſſion, and contrary to the Practice of the *Apoſtles* among other Nations, and of the *Primitive Chriſtians* in general. Therefore from the premiſes we may conclude, that it was chang'd into our Chriſtian day of Reſt, into the *Lord's Day*, that happy Day of the Reſurrection of Chriſt. And tho' there is no expreſs Command for to Warrant the change, for the Reaſons I have formerly mention'd, the Practice and Cuſtom of the Churches of Chriſtianity in all Nations approved of in the Word of God, is a ſufficient warrant for us to obſerve this Bleſſed Day in imitation of them.

Fourthly, We are in the laſt place to examine, what Obligations we have Religiouſly to keep that Day in Commemmoration of the Reſurrection of our Glorious Redeemer.

The Licentiouſneſs of this Profane Age, and the miſtakes of ſome late Writers, render this Subject needful to be inquired into;

for whatever the latter may pretend againſt the *Morality* of the *Lord's Day*, we Chriſtians are oblig'd to obſerve and dedicate it to Devotion, for the following Reaſons and Motives.

Firſt, Becauſe One Day in Seven is claimed by God as his right and due, and by his expreſs Command in the *Moral Law* order'd to be conſecrated to his *Honour* and *Service*. Nothing more reaſonable, than that we ſhould allow a part of our Time to praiſe and glorify him for our Beings, and his continual Benefits. All that we enjoy is from the Bounty of our Creator; therefore we can do no leſs than ſet apart a Time, to Worſhip, and Adore him, and acknowlege his manifold liberalities, and innumerable Mercies. The Ignorant Heathens, by the Direction and Light of Nature, are taught this part of the *Moral Law* as I have already intimated. And ſhould we Chriſtians, who are better acquainted with the *Divine Prerogatives*, and our Duties, be leſs reſpectful to God than they? Therefore the Morality of this Precept is founded upon God's Dominion and Soveraignty, and our Relation to, and dependance upon him, and his continual Providence; for this reaſon our Duty is immutable, and there can be no diſpenſation granted for the neglect of this Day, or for the Profanation of it, or the diverting and employing of it to other purpoſes, than in Acts of Religion and Piety.

Secondly,

Secondly, The Honour due to our *Redeemer*, and to his merciful and noble Performances in our *Redemption* that was this Day accompliſhed, and the glorious Advantages then procured to us by his Reſurrection and Triumph over Death, call upon us to celebrate this Day, which in all probability he order'd to be kept. It was always the cuſtom of the Church of God, to ſolemnize and perpetuate the Remembrance of glorious Victories, and notable Deliverances. What greater Victory could deſerve our Commemoration and Thankſgivings to God, than this of our Redeemer and Surety, releas'd out of the dark Priſons of Death, by the Juſtice of Heaven? Than this over our moſt dreadful Enemy, and of all the Infernal Powers? Than this in a Word, that opens to us a Paſſage, and an Entrance into a bleſſed *Immortality?* Both the Glory of our Chriſt, and our own Intereſt, as well as the Credit of our Profeſſion, challenge the obſervation of this Day. Therefore by St. *John* 'tis appropriated to him as his Day, a Day that he hath bleſſed and deſign'd for the praiſing and glorifying God, for our preſent Aſſurances of Salvation, and for our future Hopes.

Thirdly, We are oblig'd to follow the Examples of the Holy Apoſtles, and other Orthodox Chriſtians in the Rules and Practices of Religion. They have left us Patterns to imitate and to copy after them: As they

were inſpired of God, their Directions are to be obey'd, as proceeding from God, and to be eſteem'd of equal Authority, as the expreſs Orders of our Bleſſed Saviour. The *Primitive Chriſtians* imitated them, as it plainly appears by the Records of *Antiquity*, and we have no reaſon to diſſent from them. So that the Obſervation of the *Lord's Day*, is derived to us through ſo many Ages from thoſe infallible Servants and Teachers come from God, who had the Holy Spirit to direct and adviſe them. Therefore what reſpect, what veneration and eſteem, ſhould we Chriſtians have for this Day, ſo carefully tranſmitted to us from Chriſt's Apoſtles, for our devout Obſervation? How ought we to ſequeſter our ſelves from all worldly Buſineſs, and religiouſly to attend upon the Duties of the Day?

Fourthly, Not only our Obedience to God, our Relation to Chriſt, our Concernment, in our Redemption, and Obligation to imitate the Apoſtles, but alſo our own Intereſt, the Intereſt of our ſpiritual Beings, requires our devout Obſervation of the *Lord's Day*, to inſtruct the ignorant, to adviſe the doubtful, to comfort the drooping ſpirits, to glorify our Maker, and keep us in an awful Reverence of our Great God and Redeemer. Without this Avocation from our worldly Buſineſs, we are apt to be too much immerſed in temporal Affairs, and to become forgetful of God and Heaven, and of a Preparation for Eternity. This Day is

the

the moſt proper to be ſet a-part to diſpoſe our Minds for a future State, becauſe it was this Day that gave us the firſt Aſſurance of it, and conveyed our Humanity into the Fruition of it. Therefore we are to ſpend this Day in Divine Meditations, in hearing the Word of God, in Prayers and praiſing God, and in other Acts of Religion and Charity. For this purpoſe it was appointed to recall us from the World and worldly Affairs, to the Contemplation of Divine Objects, as Chriſt declares, *Mark* 2. 27. *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath.* By which Words we may underſtand, that all neceſſary, convenient, and charitable Deeds may be done on that Day; but as it was inſtituted principally for the Service of God, to keep up an Appearance of Religion amongſt Men, to withdraw them from worldly Affairs, and cauſe them to mind the Spiritual Concerns; we ought principally to employ it for the End for which it is inſtituted by God. Therefore if we have any regard for the Good and Welfare of our Souls, we ſhould not neglect the Duties of the Day, and the Purpoſes for which it was ordain'd.

Fifthly, The terrible Examples of God's Judgments inflicted in former Years, upon thoſe who have contemned the Obſervation of the *Lord's Day*, ſhould oblige us religiouſly to keep it; many are recorded by our Forefathers. A certain Perſon, not regarding

this Bleſſed Day, cauſed his Servants to houſe his Corn on that Day; but how it came to paſs 'tis not known, the Fire conſumed his Barn, and all the Corn in it, for his Contempt of the *Lord's Day*. A certain *Nobleman* in *Germany* was accuſtom'd to Hunt on the *Lord's Day*; but while he was following his Sport, his Lady was brought to Bed of a Child, that had the Head, Ears, and Mouth of a Dog, with the Cry of a Hound, to puniſh him for his Impiety. The Town of *Tiverton* in *Devonſhire*, was Twice conſumed with Fire, *A. D.* 1598. and 1612. for their labouring on the *Lord's Day*, in erecting their Standings, and preparing for their *Monday's Market*; ſince, they have been better adviſed, and have ſettled the Market on *Tueſday*. In the Year 1583. at a *Bear-baiting* on the *Lord's Day*, in *London*, the Scaffolds fell to the ground, and cruſh'd to Death Eight Perſons, beſides many others deſperately wounded. At *Riſley*, in *Bedfordſhier*, at a Play in a Chamber, the Floor fell down and kill'd and wounded many. In a Town of *France*, a certain covetous Woman, that had no reſpect for the *Lord's Day*, ſpent it in her daily Occupations in drying of Flax, which on the third *Sunday*, which ſhe uſed to profane in that Work, the Fire kindled in her Flax, and burnt her and Three of her Children. Divers have been ſcorch'd to Death with Lightning; others have been ſtruck dead with Thunder; ſome have, in the midſt of their

their Profanation of that *Holy Day*, been puniſh'd in a remarkable manner, by the Hand of God. And I cannot but obſerve here, how this Day is abuſed, neglected, and profaned in the *Engliſh Navy* at Sea, without any regard to the Service of God, Prayers, or any other Acts of Religion. If any work is to be perform'd, the Commanders will often appoint that Day to do it, that they might ſet aſide the Devotions of the Church. And I cannot but give here a Relation which I know to be true, of a certain late *Captain* of the *Swiftſure*, who being appointed to ſail to *Argiers*, to renew the Peace with thoſe *Pyrates*: After he had concluded his Buſineſs with thoſe *Infidels*, invited their principal Men on Board his Ship, to a Feaſt on their *Sabbath-day*, which is *Friday*; they refuſed to go on that Day, telling him, That it was a Day, that by their *Mahumetan Law*, they were to employ in Devotions and Prayer to God, and that they never allowed to themſelves on that Day the Liberties of Feaſting, and other Licenciouſneſs common on ſuch Occaſions. Upon this Refual, the Captain invited them on our *Sunday*, to come on Board to divert themſelves, and borrowed the Muſick of the Commander of the Marines, to play to the *Turks*; but he having more ſenſe of Religion than the *Sea Captain*, order'd it to ceaſe, and refuſed them his Company. By this it appears, that the *Turks* are more ſtrict and zealous Obſervers of

their *Sabbath*, than ſome *Chriſtians* are of ours. Truly, we may with reaſon aſcribe the Debaucheries and Profaneneſs of the Seas, partly to the neglect of Religion on that Day; for in ſome Ships I have known Pious *Chaplains*, who have not been ſuffer'd ſo much as to offer up publickly the Prayers of the Church; but inſtead of God's Service, the Employment of the Principal Officers was Gaming, Drinking, Curſing, Damning, *&c.* to the great Reproach of our Nation.

Now I have taken notice that moſt of our Sea-fights have been on that Day, as a Puniſhment from God, for the Impiety that we are guilty of on that Bleſſed Day. I could inſtance many other Examples of the ſevere Judgments of God, inflicted on the Deſpiſers of the *Lord's Day*, which are ſufficient Warnings to Poſterity, to reverence the Day of the Lord's Reſurrection, and to employ it in Acts of Religion and Piety, in the Service of God, and for the Welfare of our Immortal Souls.

Of

Of Original Sin, *with which Infants are Infected.*

AMongſt the ſeveral Sects of the *Anabaptiſts*, or Enemies of *Infant-Baptiſm*, that ſwarm amongſt us, I find ſome infected with the *Pelagian Hereſy*, who deny *Original Sin*. A dangerous Error! condemn'd long ago by the *Chriſtian Church*. To convince theſe of their Miſtakes in this particular, I purpoſe,

Firſt, To enquire what *Original Sin* is:

Secondly, What Proofs we have from Holy Scripture and Reaſon, that all Mankind are naturally defiled with it.

Thirdly, What Judgment the Learned World in all Ages have given of this Original Pollution? And what Remedy they judge Chriſt hath appointed in his Church.

In anſwer to the firſt Queſtion. *Original Sin* conſiſts partly in the Guilt of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, imputed unto us by the Juſtice of God, becauſe of a Lineal Deſcent from him in the common Order of Generation; and partly in the Corruption of our Natures, originally alienated from God and Goodneſs, and inclinable to Sin by a tendency of our ſenſual Appetites, derived to us from our Parents. To this Definition agrees the 19th Article of the Church of *England*. *Original Sin ſtandeth not in the following of*

Adam; *but it is the fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man, that naturally is ingendred of the Off ſpring of* Adam, *whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteauſneſs, and is of his Nature inclin'd to Evil, ſo that the Fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit; and therefore in every Perſon born into this World, it deſerveth God's Wrath and Damnation. And this Infection in Nature doth remain in them that are regenerated, whereby the Luſt of the Fleſh, called in* Greek, Phronema Sarkos, *which ſome do expound the Wiſdom, ſome Senſuality, ſome the Affection, ſome the deſire of the Fleſh, is not ſubject to the Law of God. And tho' there is no Condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apoſtle doth confeſs, that Concupiſcence and Luſt hath of it ſelf the Nature of Sin.* And the Anabaptiſts Catechiſm ſaith, *The Covenant being made with* Adam, *not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity, all Mankind deſcending from him by ordinary Generation, ſinned in him, and fell with him in his firſt Tranſgreſſion; ſo that the Fall brought Mankind into an Eſtate of Sin and Miſery,* &c. Some of our Adverſaries here, and in their Confeſſion of Faith, acknowledge *Original Sin* in Infants, whereby they are out of *Communion with God, under his Wrath and Curſe,* &c. According to this Deſcription, *Original Sin* conſiſts in Two Particulars: *Firſt,* In the Imputation of *Adam's* Diſobedience to all his Deſcendants, as intereſted in him, the Founder of the Humane

Humane Race. As when a *Noble Man* is degraded from his Nobility by reaſon of his Rebellion againſt his Prince, all his Poſterity forfeit their Honour in him, and loſe their Privilege; ſo *Adam* loſt for himſelf and all his Progeny, by his eating the Forbidden Fruit, the Favour of his God, and drew upon himſelf and them, his Lord's Diſpleaſure. *Secondly*, It conſiſts in a Natural Corruption, convey'd to us from our ſinful Parents; which Corruption reſides in a diſorder of the Animal Part, and a tendency of the Senſual, to Sin and Luſt, which draws along with it the Affections of the Mind, being thereunto encouraged by the frequent Temptations that we meet with. Likewiſe the *Aſſemblies Catechiſm*, from which the *Anabaptiſts* have copy'd theirs, declares, *That the ſinfulneſs of that Eſtate whereunto Man fell, conſiſts in the Guilt of* Adam's *firſt Sin, the want of Original Righteouſneſs, and the Corruption of his whole Nature, which is commonly called Original Sin, together with all actual Tranſgreſſions which proceed from it; ſo that all Mankind by the Fall loſt Communion with God, are under his Wrath and Curſe, and ſo made liable to all Miſeries in this Life, to Death it ſelf, and to the Pains of Hell.* I mention theſe Teſtimonies, to diſcover to thoſe Ignorant Souls, who will allow of no *Original Sin* in Infants, how they diſagree with the reſt of Diſſenters, as well as with our Church's Doctrine. I muſt alſo obſerve

that

that the *Assembly of Divines* made *Original Sin* consist in Three Particulars, whereas in reality there are but Two, for the Guilt of *Adam*'s Transgression, and the want of Original Righteousness, is one and the same.

Now to prove this *Original Sin*, it will be in vain to alledge the Judgment and Declarations of the Protestant Divines; for the *Pelagian Anabaptists* will not be perswaded by them; I shall therefore bring the plain Texts of the Holy Scripture, that affirm it. St. *Paul*, *Eph.* 2. 3. tells us, *That by nature we are children of wrath, even as others.* We can't be Children of Wrath, and Innocent; for God's Wrath is set only against the Guilty and Polluted Sons and Daughters of *Adam*. If therefore something were not found in us of Original Guilt and Defilement, derived to us from our Parents, we could not be liable to the Justice and Displeasure of our Soveraign Lord; and tho' Infants are not guilty of any Personal Offence; because they proceed from, and are concern'd with a defiled Nature, they cannot be pure, and altogether free from the Uncleanness of that same from whence they issue. To this purpose are the Words of *Job*, Chap. 14. ver. 4. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* If therefore our Predecessors, from whom we are derived, are inclinable to Sin and Evil, as the Word of God often tells us, their Children cannot but

but have ſomething of that Original Pollution that is in them, and of that Primitive Guilt. Therefore *Job* ſpeaks more plainly to the ſame purpoſe, *Chap.* 25. *ver.* 4, 5, 6. *How can a man be juſtified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it ſhineth not, yea, the ſtars are not pure in his ſight. How much leſs man, that is a worm, and the ſon of man, which is a worm?* And *David*, *Pſal.* 51. 5. declares in expreſs Terms, *Behold, I was ſhapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me.* His very Make and Frame, and his Subſtance and Compoſition was infected with Iniquity and Sin from the Womb. Therefore St. *Paul* tells the *Epheſ.* 2. 12. That before they were made nigh by the Blood of Chriſt, *they were without Chriſt, aliens from the commonwealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the covenant of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the World.* This is the ſad and woful State of ſuch as are not admitted into the Covenant of Grace. They are in the State of defiled Nature, without Chriſt, out of his Viſible Church and Society, and out of God's Favour as far as we can judge, liable to Death, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. *As in Adam all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* If Death is inflicted upon Infants, 'tis a Sign of their Guilt; for Death was threatned as the Penalty of Sin. To this agrees St. *Paul's* Words, *Gal.* 3. 22. *The ſcripture hath concluded*

cluded all under ſin, Infants as well as others. If they were free from Sin, they would not ſuffer the Puniſhment threatned, which is Death; but as they cannot be charg'd with actual Tranſgreſſions, they are and muſt be ſubject to the Original: Therefore God declares, *That there is none righteous, no not one.* Shall we except our Children, when God does not? Again, St. *Paul* ſaith, *All have ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God.* If they have not actually ſinned, they have ſinned in their firſt Parents, being in their Loins in the ſame manner, as is ſaid *Heb.* 7. 9. *Levi who receiveth tithes paid tithes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchiſedec met him.* According to the ſame ſenſe we have ſinned in *Adam*, becauſe we were then in his Loins. The ſame Apoſtle often repeats this Doctrine, *Rom.* 5. *Wherefore as by one man ſin enter'd into the world, and death by ſin, and ſo death paſſed upon all men, for that all have ſinned.* Again, *By the offence of one many are dead. By the offence of one death reigned. By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation. And by one man's diſobedience many were made ſinners*, &c. I judge theſe are ſuch undeniable Texts, to prove *Original Sin*, that none but thoſe who are wilfully blind muſt acknowledge, that we are by Nature polluted with it. Now the Enemies of this Doctrine are ready to object:

Firſt,

First, How can this agree with the Juſtice of God? That Children ſhould ſuffer for the Sin of their firſt Parents, ſo long ago committed, and which they could not hinder?

I anſwer in the Language of St. *Paul*, They were in the Loins of the Founder of the Humane Race, and the Natural Covenant of Obedience was made with *Adam* in his Perſon, and as he repreſented all his Poſterity: Therefore in him they all fell from their primitive Integrity, and from him they derive natural Guilt and Corruption with the ſubſtance of their Bodies, as from an infected Fountain, or Source. And why God has permitted our coming into the World in this manner, we are not to inquire; but we are inform'd in his Holy Word, That all are included under Sin, to Magnify the more his Mercy in our Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt; his Infinite Wiſdom in that wonderful Contrivance; and his Goodneſs and Power in advancing us through Death to the Seat of his Glory.

Secondly, Again they object, Do not the Bodies of Men proceed from God's Agency in the Womb? Seeing *David* tells us, *Pſalm* 119. 73. *Thy Hands have made me and faſhion'd me.* And *Pſal.* 139. 16. *Thine Eyes did ſee my Subſtance, yet being unperfect, and in thy Book all my Members were written, which in continuance were faſhion'd, &c.* Therefore

can

can any thing proceed from God, but what is pure, undefiled and good, as to the Bodies of Men?

I answer, In the first Creation, Man proceeding immediately from God was perfect and holy; but afterwards, by disobedience and compliance with the Devil's Temptation, by forsaking his Maker and adhering to his Enemy, he hath disordered his natural Faculties, and is become defiled with Guilt and Corruption. Now all that proceeds from such a Polluted Original, cannot but bear away a savour and marks of its Primitive Source. And tho' God by his Providence, Blessing, and continuance of the Humane Race, hath an inspection and a hand in the Conception, Formation, and Generation of Mankind, from the first beginning he hath granted to the seminal matter a secret vertue of dilating it self into the several Members and parts of the Body, as he has given to all other Species, Animals, Plants, and Seeds to produce their several kinds, to multiply and increase by a command and order mention'd, *Gen.* 1. 22, 28. Therefore now we come into the World in the ordinary course and method, which God has appointed from the first Creation, and wherein he is not the only Agent, as he was then, but as we proceed from our sinful Parents; the Judgement of *Job* is indisputably true, *How can he be clean that is born of a Woman?* For that reason our Blessed Redeemer was to appear

bear in the World in an extraordinary manner: *A Virgin was to conceive and bear a Son* by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, that was to overſhadow her, that the Body and Humanity that was to be united to the Eternal Son of God, might be free from all manner of defilements and Original imperfection, *Luke* 1. 35. Therefore his coming into the World differ'd very much from ours, as to his external part. For the Soul, when the Body in the Womb is duly Organiz'd, and become a fit Receptacle of that Spiritual Being, 'tis generally believed, that then God breathes into it the Breath of Life, gives to it an Immortal Spirit, which proceeds not *ex traduce* as ſome vain and unconſiderate Perſons have imagin'd; but from the immediate hand of the Father of Spirits, *Eccleſ.* 12. 7. And as the Soul or Spirit comes from God alone, we cannot think that to be any wiſe in the condition of the Body and Animal Part; but why the Creator of all things ſuffers an undefiled Soul to be joyned with a Polluted Companion, is a Queſtion that deſerves the Anſwer of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 9 20. *Who art thou O Man! That replieſt againſt God? Shall the thing formed, ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou made me thus? Has not the Potter power over the Clay? &c.* The Secrets of God's proceedings in Nature and Providence, are not to be judg'd nor fathom'd by the Skill and ſhort Reaſon of Man. 'Tis ſufficient for us to know by Revelation; that we are born of and deſcended

ſcended from *Adam*, naturally Children o Wrath, liable to Temporal and Eterna Death, without the Mercy of God, and th Redemption of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *Rom.* 5 17, 21. And that Infants are to be partaker of this Redemption; for there is no othe name or means of Salvation, but that of ou Bleſſed Saviour, *Acts* 4. 12. Therefore they as well as the Adult Perſons, have a method offer'd to them to be partakers of our Lord' Redemption, and to be enter'd into hi Church, as belonging to his Purchaſe and Pe culium.

Thirdly, Now if we inquire what th Learned World in all Ages have ſaid of thi Original Sin, we ſhall find them agreein with us, and judging both Children, a well as thoſe of Riper years, under a neceſſi ty to come to the Laver of Regeneration *i. e.* Baptiſm; that they might be abſolve from this Original Guilt and Pollution, an admitted into a State of Grace and Mercy A Learned Father ſaith in expreſs Terms *Nec parvuli de quibuslibet ſanctis juſtiſq; procre ati Originalis peccati abſolvuntur, niſi in Chriſt fuerint Baptizati. l.* 2. *de Peccat. c.* 12. *Eph.* 2 Infants born of never ſo Holy and Righte ous Parents are not freed from the Guil of Original Sin, unleſs they be Baptized int Chriſt. *Tertullian* ſpeaks as plain to the ſam purpoſe, *Homo a primordio circumventus, u præceptum Dei excederet, & propterea in morte datus, exinde totum genus de ſuo ſemine infectum* &c.

Man having been from the beginning ceived, as he ſlighted the Commandment of od, he was Condemn'd to dye; from him whole Race is infected by his Seed, *de eſt. Anim. contra Gentes*, and in his Treatiſe *Hab. Mul.* He charges the unhappineſs of , with all the diſmal Conſequences, on our randmother *Eve*, as the firſt Original. ikewiſe *Irenæus* tells us, *c.* 5. *Non aliter luari Homines ab antiqua Serpentis Plaga, niſi idant in eum qui ſecundum ſimilitudinem nis peccati in ligno Martyrii exaltatur a terra:* len cannot otherwiſe be reſcued from the iſchief of the Ancient Serpent, unleſs they elieve in him, who according to the ſimiitude of the Sinful fleſh, is lifted up from e Earth upon the Wood of his Croſs. Aain, *c.* 21. *Ut quem ad modum per Hominem ictum deſcendit in mortem Genus noſtrum; iterum per hominem Victorem aſcendamus in itam.* As our Human Race are fallen into Death by Man overcome; ſo we ariſe to ife by man a Conqueror. Theſe words of *renæus* expreſs the ſame truth as St. *Paul*, Cor. 15. *As in Adam all dye, ſo in Chriſt ſhall ll be made alive*; for as Death is the Wages f Sin, none are Condemn'd to that Penalty y a juſt God, unleſs they be defiled with Sin. o the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks St. *Chryſoſtome* f our firſt Parents, *They being by Sin become orruptible, they begat Children inclinable to the ame weakneſs; and they being born ſo qualified, hey had their Luſts, their Fears and Pleaſures to accompany*

accompany them. The ſame Author takes no tice, That *Adam* knew his Wife after he ha Sinned, in the 50th *Pſalm*, which we reckо the 51ſt. So that according to his Opinio none of *Adam*'s Children were begot in State of Innocency, but after the Fall, an our Parents diſobedience. By that mean they became both Guilty and Corrupt: A the Fathers were of the ſame Judgment i Relation to Original Sin, but chiefly S *Auguſtin*; who maintain'd this Divine Trut againſt the *Pelagian Sect*, who, tho' the denied *Original Sin*, yet they had not the Im pudence to refuſe Baptiſm to Infants; bu judg'd it neceſſary, becauſe of Chriſt's ſaying *Except a Perſon be born of Water and the Spiri he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* A mongſt our Modern Divines, I find non queſtioning Original Guilt and Corruptio with which we enter into the World. Th Churches of *France*, in the firſt Confeſſion o their Faith, believe, *That all the Off-ſpring o* Adam *are infected with the Contagion of Origi nal Sin, which is a Vice hereditary by Propaga tion, and not only by Imitation, as the Pelagian aſſerted, whoſe Errors are deteſted by us, Article* 10. *A. D.* 1559. This Confeſſion was com poſed and publiſhed at their firſt National Synod, Celebrated in the City of *Paris*, ſee *Quick*'s *Synod. Vol.* 1. *p.* 6. To this Doctrine that Eminent and Orthodox Divine *Zanchius* agrees, *In peccato Originali, in quo omnes con cipimur & naſcimur, duo ſunt Inobedientia Ada*

tanquam

anquam capitis Noſtri, nobis tanquam ejus Membris juſtiſſime imputata, & Corruptio, &c. l. 2. c. 5. *de Anim.* In *Original Sin*, in which we are all conceiv'd and born, there are Two things, the Diſobedience of *Adam* juſtly imputed from our Head to us, as to his Members, and Corruption, *&c.* And Mr. *Calvin* in his *Inſtit. Chriſt. Relig.* enforceth this Truth by a ſtrong Reaſon, *Nec mirum ſi Genus ſuum peſſundedit ſua Defectione, qui totum Naturæ Ordinem pervertit in Cœlo & in Terra,* l. 2. c. 1. 5. 'Tis no wonder if *Adam* has Ruin'd his whole Race by his Apoſtacy, ſince he hath ſubverted the whole Order of Nature in Heaven and Earth. And a little after, *Quum ergo ſurſum & deorſum ex ejus Culpa fluxerit maledictio, quæ graſſatur per omnes Mundi Plagas, nihil a ratione alienum, ſi propagata fuerit ad totam ejus ſobolem.* Therefore ſeeing from his Crime there is derived a Curſe to things above and below him, which has carried a Deſtruction to all parts of the World, 'tis not contrary to reaſon, that it ſhould be Conveyed to his Progeny. Likewiſe *Bucan.* in his *Loc. Com.* 15. ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, *Peccatum Originale ab Adamo derivatur in Omnes deſcendentes, ne Infantibus quidem exceptis in utero Matrum conceptis. Nam licet Iniquitatis fructus non protulerint, eorum tamen Naturæ eſt quoddam peccati ſemen & ideo Deo odioſa & abominabilis,* Rom. 5. 14. Original Sin is derived from *Adam* upon all his Poſterity, the very Children conceived

in the Womb of their Mothers not exce
ted; for tho' they have not produc'd a
Fruits of Iniquity, their Nature is a Seed
Sin, and therefore odious and abominable
God. And *Wendelin* in his *Christian Theolog*
l. 1. *c.* 10. proves, That all Mankind pr
ceeding from *Adam* and his Posterity in th
natural order, are infected with Origin
Sin, the *Virgin Mary* not excepted; becau
the Holy Scripture, without any reserv
charges all Persons descended from *Ada*
with Sin, Christ excepted, *Rom.* 3. 10, 1
12. *Rom.* 5. 12. *Gal.* 3. 22. because we ar
all subject to Misery and Death, which pr
ceed from Sin; because we have need
Pardon and Forgiveness, and to be partake
of the Redemption of Christ, to return in
to the favour of our God. The sam
Doctrine was taught in the Confession
the *Bohemians*, which was that of the An
tient *Albigenses* and *Vaudois*. *Est innatum*
hæreditarium Peccatum Originis, in quo omne
concipimur, & in hunc mundum nascimur: Ori
ginal Sin is born with us and hereditary
We are all conceived in it, and come int
the World with it. Likewise in the Con
fession of *Wirtemberg* we meet with thes
words, *Idq; Malum*, i. e. *Peccatum non in un*
tantum Adamo constitisse, sed propagati in omnem
Posteritatem ejus: That the evil of Sin con
sisted not only in *Adam*, but was propaga
ted and spread to all his Posterity. We ma
by these Quotations, which I judge sufficie

en

at prove the Bleſſed Harmony of all Orthodox Churches of Chriſt agreeing together in this Doctrine with the Church of *England*; That all Mankind ſince the fall of our firſt Parents, born of the mixture of the Seed of Men and Women, bring into the World with them *Original Sin.*

Of

Of Forms of Prayer in the Publick Wor-ſhip of God; And of the Liturgy of the Church of England.

THIS Sect, as moſt of our Diſſenters have declar'd a particular Enmity a-gainſt all Forms of Worſhip, and the De-votions of our Church, for they are con-trary to its chief Deſign, which is Divi-ſion; and becauſe they are not agreeable with that diſorderly Spirit that reigns a-mongſt them, which gratifies every idle and empty Fancy, with the Liberty to vent what they pleaſe in ſpeaking to God and Men. To prevent Irreverence, Nonſenſe, Confu-ſion, and what is worſe, Blaſphemy in this Caſe, it has always been thought adviſeable in all Regular Churches that profeſs Chriſti-anity, both Ancient and Modern, to have Publick Forms of Prayers and of Divine Worſhip, and not to leave the Diſpoſition of a Service of that importance, to the Di-cretion of every Individual Perſon or Mini-ſter, becauſe of the Weakneſs, Miſtakes, and corrupt Intentions of Men. And there is no Nation or Church now extant in the World, but preſcribes a Method and Form of Divine Service, to be uſed and practiſed in the Publick Congregations; from which Men living within the Juriſdiction, and of the ſame Communion, are not ſuffer'd to

vary

vary, but in ours and in *Holland*; ſo generally Forms of Prayer are approved of by all Chriſtian Churches in the Publick Worſhip of God. But to give ſatisfaction in this Caſe to our Diſſenters, I am now to prove,

Firſt, That Forms of Prayer in the Publick Service of God, are of a Divine Appointment, and have ever been uſed by the Churches of God in all Ages.

Secondly, That they are the moſt convenient, moſt proper, moſt uſeful, and neceſſary for the due Performance of the Divine Service, and for the Benefit of the Petitioners.

Thirdly, That the Forms of Prayer enjoyn'd in the Church of *England*, and our manner of offering them up to God, anſwer theſe Two Ends, the Glory of God, and the Edification of the ſerious, humble, and devout Aſſiſtants.

Firſt, That Forms of Prayer in the Publick Service of God, are of a Divine Appointment, and have ever been uſed in the Churches of God in all Ages. In the *Jewiſh* Church, from its firſt Eſtabliſhment we read, that *Moſes* compoſed Pſalms, of Thankſgiving, and Prayers, for his People to expreſs their ſenſe of God's Favours, Greatneſs, Eternity, and Goodneſs, and to acknowledge their own Unworthineſs and Provocations: The 90th Pſalm is of his compoſure for that purpoſe; and in *Exodus*, *Deuteronomy*, &c. we read of

Forms and Rules to be practiſed by the *Iſraelites*, at the eating of the Paſchal Lamb, and other Adminiſtrations. For the ſame purpoſe the *Pſalms of David* were recommended to the People of God, to be uſed in his Publick Worſhip; therefore 2 *Chron.* 29, 30. *Hezekiah the king and the princes, commanded the Levites to ſing praiſe unto the Lord, with the words of David and of Aſaph the Seer, and they ſung praiſes with gladneſs, and they bowed their heads and worſhipped.* For that Intent thoſe Pſalms were adapted to the ſeveral Conditions of the Church of God, to be made uſe of in various Occaſions. Likewiſe under the Goſpel, we have that moſt excellent and comprehenſive Form of Prayer of our Redeemer's compoſing, call'd the *Lord's Prayer*; and his Diſciples are commanded by him to uſe it, *Luke* 11. 1, 2. *One of his diſciples ſaid unto him, Lord teach us to pray, as John alſo taught his Diſciples. And he ſaid unto them, when ye pray ſay, Our Father*, &c. By this Text we may underſtand that *John*, the greateſt of Prophets, had taught his Diſciples Forms of Prayer, ſuitable to his Miſſion and Doctrine. For that reaſon one of Chriſt's Diſciples ſollicited him to recommend unto them a Model of Prayer. To gratify this pious and reaſonable Requeſt our Saviour expreſly commands them to uſe this *Form of Prayer, Our Father*, &c. and *Matth.* 6. 9. *After this manner pray ye, Our Father*, &c. That is, let all your Prayers be com

compos'd and model'd after this Pattern: *First*, To prefer the Glory of God before your private or publick Intereſts; according to the ſame religious Uſage St. *Paul* appoints and exhorts *Timothy*, 1 *Ep.* 2. 1. *That firſt of all ſupplications, prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in Authority*, &c. Here is a Model preſcrib'd by the Apoſtle, and this belov'd Diſciple was to word the Publick Prayers accordingly. Thus ſet Forms of Prayer are approved of by the Spirit of God in his Holy Word, and by the Practice of Chriſt and of his Holy Apoſtles. Thus from the Beginning, the Church of God have had Publick Prayers in uſe, compos'd by the religious Rulers. The Prayers of the *Greek and Eaſtern Congregations* are yet extant in the Writings of the Fathers; and the preſent Chriſtian Churches in *France*, in the *Netherlands*, *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Swedeland*, and *Denmark*, have all their Forms for their Publick Devotions. So Univerſal a Practice of God's People in moſt Nations of Orthodox Principles, ſhould prevail upon our Diſſenters not to deſpiſe or neglect ſo neceſſary and pious a Cuſtom, derived to us from Chriſt and his Holy Apoſtles. For our *Anabaptiſts* have not only rejected all Publick Forms, but have condemn'd, and many of them caſt Dirt, and abuſe, by blaſphemous Expreſſions, the *Lord's Prayer*. Now how can theſe Men have the Impudence to boaſt, that they

exactly follow the Rules of Holy Scripture in all things, while they are ſo directly contrary to it in this Caſe? And as Forms are regular Directions for Prayer, can they entertain the Thought, that their irregular and unwarrantable Performances are more acceptable to God, than Prayers approved, and Divine Forms? for, I ſuppoſe, that they oppoſe to Forms only their Prayers *extempore*; otherwiſe, if they are compos'd by themſelves and fix'd in their Memories, they are then Forms of their own Invention. In ſuch a Caſe they condemn their own Practices, by exclaiming againſt all Forms. But which may be judg'd moſt valuable by Men of Reaſon, thoſe that are recommended to us by the wiſe Governors of the Nation, by Men of Piety and Learning; or thoſe Forms that are regulated by, and proceed from a Private Spirit, perhaps of a Blue, White, Green, or Leathern Apron *Apoſtle* or *Biſhop* of the *Anabaptiſts*? For unleſs theſe Mechanick Teachers pretend to Inſpiration and Enthuſiaſm, there is no other way to offer our Prayers, but by the Aſſiſtance of Forms, either imprinted in our Memories, or before us in a Book, or *extempore*, which ſuppoſes either the Matter or the Words to break ſuddenly out of our Imagination, with or without a Premeditation. If with, ſuch Prayers are near related to thoſe we offer to God with Forms; for the Matter or the Expreſſions, or perhaps both, are formed

formed in our Minds, before we vent them, and utter them with our Tongues. Now 'tis my purpoſe to ſhew in the next Place,

Secondly, That Forms of Prayer are the moſt convenient and proper, moſt uſeful and neceſſary, for the due Performance of the Divine Service, and for the benefit of the Aſſiſtants. 'Tis indeed very ſtrange, that our *Anabaptiſts*, and particularly *Joſeph Hooke*, that wiſe *Apoſtle*, ſhould glory in their weakneſs and ſhame; *That they have neither Common Prayer, Rubrick, nor Directory, nor any Forms*, as if all Rules and Directions to aſſiſt our Devotions, were contrary to the Will of God, and his Holy Word. But tho' theſe Men have declared their Averſion againſt Rules in this Caſe, as they are agreeable with Scripture Examples and Precepts, they are the moſt convenient and proper, moſt uſeful and neceſſary for the due Performance of the Divine Service. The Honour to be render'd to the Majeſty of our Creator and Redeemer, requires that Men ſhould appear before him not abruptly, but with a ſerious Preparation, and with a ready and well compos'd Mind and Petitions, of which we on a ſudden are not capable. For that reaſon *Solomon* adviſes, *Keep thy Foot when thou goeſt to the houſe of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the ſacrifice of fools. Be not raſh with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be haſty to utter any thing before God, for God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth; therefore*

let thy words be few. Are we not to have as much Regard for our God, as we commonly have for Princes and Great Men? Don't we ſtudy to ſpeak adviſedly in their Preſence? And does leſs reſpect become our Almighty God? What aſſurance have we, that all our ſudden and haſty Expreſſions ſhall be anſwerable to the Duty, Reverence, and Submiſſion, that we owe to ſo good and glorious a Being, and that nothing ſhall eſcape us, that may ſavour of Weakneſs or Sin? If Men underſtood the Difficulty of performing this part of Religion as they ought, they would not quarrel at the Helps offer'd to us, to preſent our Petitions with more Zeal and Affection. Who knows but that ſome unexpected Accident may diſorder our Prayers, diſturb our Minds, and cauſe Tautologes, Nonſenſe, and unlawful Expreſſions to drop from our Mouths. Tho' ſome may be gifted with a voluble Tongue, quick Apprehenſion, and other Abilities requiſite in all *extempore* long Prayers, What ſhall others do, not ſo well gifted? They muſt needs come ſhort in what is wanted in this moſt neceſſary and ſpiritual Duty: Therefore not only in reſpect to God and his Glory, but in Reference to the Wants and Weakneſſes of Men, our ſet Forms are proper and neceſſary. For in all publick Devotions, there is a regard to be had of the Infirmities of the weakeſt ſort of Men, who tho' they may not be concern'd in ſpeaking from the People to God, yet as Hearers

Hearers they can better underſtand, offer up, and preſent their Requeſts, when they are acquainted with the Matter and Expreſſions, and know before hand that they are anſwerable to their Neceſſities, and agreeable with the Will of God, which they cannot ſo quickly apprehend, when they know not what the Miniſter will ſay, whether it be juſt and a fit Petition to make to God; there muſt be ſome time allowed, tho' but a Minute, or a Moment, to make ſuch an Examination and Reflection; before he can perform it, the ſpeaker proceeds on to other Requeſts. So that without ſet Forms, with which we are acquainted, I ſee no likelihood of the Hearers keeping pace with the Miniſter, and joyning in Attention and Affection with him in every Supplication. And for the Miniſter himſelf, if he hath never ſo quick and admirable Abilities for a long *extempore* Prayer, and be never ſo much accuſtomed to utter himſelf to God in this manner, he has but one Soul, and one Thought at the ſame Inſtant, one Imagination, that is to find out the Matter, Words, and Expreſſions. While 'tis thus employ'd and occupied to find fit Expreſſions to God, according to the Subject, how can he at the ſame inſtant of Time move the Affections of his Mind, which are neceſſarily requir'd, and muſt ſpeak unto God, or elſe the Devotion is very lame and inſignificant. We may hear from the Mouth, an eloquent Harangue, pathetick Expreſſions,

a fine Diſcourſe, but if the Affections of the Heart be wanting, the Sacrifice is dead. The Whiſperings of a devout Heart, are more acceptable to God than the Loud Orations of the moſt eloquent Tongues. Now when the Miniſter knows before, what he is to ſay, and the People likewiſe, they are beforehand prepared to preſent their Petitions to the Throne of Grace with that Holy Zeal and Devotion as becomes them, which they have time and leaſure to deviſe in their Minds. 'Tis therefore our Saviour's ſaying, *That as God is a ſpirit, they that will worſhip truly, muſt worſhip in ſpirit and in truth*, John 4. 23, 24. The meaning of Chriſt is, that our Prayers and Devotions muſt have ſomething above a Carnal and Formal Performance, they muſt be ſent up to God, not only from the Attention and Intention of the Soul, that ſpiritual Being, but alſo from the fervent Affections of the Heart. Such a Method is the moſt convenient and proper for this purpoſe, that may render us able to offer up our Petitions in that holy and acceptable manner. Again, Our Prayers may be ſaid to be a Worſhip in Spirit, when we know they are ſuitable to the Dictates of the Spirit of God, anſwerable to Divine Revelation. This ſpiritual Service we may beſt underſtand from and in preſcribed Forms, ſooner than from a Prayer that we never heard before.

I muſt confeſs 'tis the moſt difficult Duty that belongs to a Chriſtian's Life; therefore we

we ſhould ſeek for all the Aſſiſtance, as of Nature, Grace, and Art, to render to our God in Prayer all the Homage that his Sovereignty claims, and his daily Benefits and our Obligations require from us. For 'tis repreſented by Divines, *to be the earneſt affection of the heart lifted up to God, by which we Petition and expect from him alone, for Chriſt's ſake, ſpiritual and corporal Bleſſings, according to his Order and Promiſes, and by which we return him Thanks for his former Favours.* Now this Elevation of the Heart and Mind, is not an eaſy Performance to Fleſh and Blood, particularly when Men are immers'd in ſenſual Delights, and clog'd with worldly Concerns and Diſturbances.

Thirdly, *The Forms of Prayer enjoyn'd in the Church of* England, *and our manner of offering them up to God, anſwer theſe Two Ends, the Glory of God, and the Edification of the ſerious, humble, and devout Aſſiſtants.* This will more plainly appear, if we conſider the matter, or ſubſtance, and manner of preſenting our Petitions. Firſt, The matter and ſubſtance tends to the Glory of God, to glorify his Goodneſs, Mercy, Power, Allſufficiency, and Infinite Perfections, which the Petitioners publickly acknowledge. There is no Clauſe nor Expreſſion in all the Offices that can be interpreted to any other purpoſe; and our ſeeking from him all things needful for our Souls and Bodies, is an open Declaration of our owning him to be our Rich and

Bountiful Benefactor. *Secondly*, The manner inward and outward, tends directly to this Bleſſed End: The inward, for while we hear the Words pronounced, which we know to be agreeable to the Will of God, we are to ſtir up our Affections zealouſly to offer up the Petitions to our good God, and to accompany the Miniſter's Words with our hearty Deſires. And as there is a Part that the People are to be concern'd in the Offices, this is to ſummon their Attention, and encourage their Devotion. The outward manner of preſenting our Requeſts, tends to the Glory of God; for we have that profound Reſpect for our Almighty Creator, that we dare not come before him, to offer to him the haſty and inconſiderate Requeſts of our Lips, or of ōthers. But as theſe Petitions have been duly examin'd, and approved of by the Wiſdom of the Rulers of our Church and Nation, and by our ſelves; we know them to be agreeable to God's Will, and therefore are certain that they will be acceptable to him, when we offer them up with the Humility of the Body, and the Devotion of the Mind, according to the preſcribed Rules.

Likewiſe in all theſe ſeveral Reſpects, they tend to the Edification of the ſerious, humble, and devout Chriſtian; To inſtruct and confirm him in the Orthodox Principles of true Religion; To adviſe him in his Duty and Homage to his good God; To encourage his

his Faith, Hope, and Aſſurance in his Mercy; To keep him in a Diſpoſition of Humility, and a proper Object of Divine Goodneſs; and in a Word, To prepare his Soul for a Bleſſed Eternity. Is there any Requeſt in all our Publick Prayers, that the Diſſenters would not be glad to receive and obtain from God? All the Neceſſities of Mankind are there conſider'd, and a Supply is humbly requeſted of God to their ſeveral Wants. The vain Repetitions objected, is an idle and inſignificant Exception; and that our Prayers are taken out of the Maſs-Book, is another Fanatick Fancy? Is there any thing there, that ſavours of the Popiſh Superſtitions and Errors? 'Tis very ſtrange, that the Pope and his Agents ſhould declare ſuch an unreconcilable Averſion againſt them, if they were agreeable with their Perſwaſions. Theſe Prayers at the beginning of our Reformation (which for the Honour of it was carried on and compleated without popular Tumults and Rebellion) were compos'd by the Biſhops and Learned and Orthodox Divines of the Nation, and purg'd from all Dregs of Popery and Idolatry; for as our Wiſe Saviour, when he eſtabliſh'd the Chriſtian Church, took from the *Jews* divers Rites and Practices, and ſtamp'd them with his Divine Authority, as the Matter of both Sacraments of a *Jewiſh* Original: So our firſt Reformers thought not convenient totally to aboliſh all the former Prayers, but to remove from them the Droſs and

and Corruption, and to keep a great part of the Subſtance and Method in our Devotions. In this proceeding they had the Example of our Bleſſed Maſter, to warrant their Prudence; they thought it not Juſtice nor Wiſdom to the diſlike of the Innocent and Orthodox Uſages of the Popiſh Church; to deſtroy the whole Body that was ſound, becauſe of ſome rotten parts, and to declare an Enmity againſt them all, meerly becauſe they were practiſed by them; many of theſe Uſages having been in the Churches of God, before they became Popiſh, and we find them both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Congregations. For theſe and other Reaſons, I intreat our Diſſenters, who are ſo averſe to our Publick Prayers, ſeriouſly to weigh without prejudice in an equal Balance, all the Exceptions that are commonly made againſt them, with what we have to ſay for our ſelves, and they ſhall find them very light and unreaſonable. They ſhall find Pride and Fancy, Education and Cuſtom, Intereſt and Engagements, Partiality and Miſtakes, the principal Cauſes of their Diſpleaſure and Diſtaſte at our Devotions, which the Wiſdom of the Nation prefers to a Preſbyterian *Directory*, or the irregular and *extempore* Tones and Cants of Enthuſiaſtick *Anabaptiſts*. They are poſſeſſed with ſuch a Hatred againſt them, that they refuſe to be preſent when we pray, and will admit no manner of Religious Communion with us, as if we were *Turks* and *Infidels*. Their Teachers

Teachers incourage in all their Diſciples an Averſion to our Church, and the Principles of Diviſion, which are entertain'd by their ſimple and unadviſed Profelytes; for this Perſwaſion is proper to humor only the ignorant and diſaffected Vulgar. I ſhall therefore next inquire into

The Sinfulneſs of Schiſm and Separation from the Church of England.

UNION and Unity in Religion, amongſt all Chriſt's Diſciples, is one of the principal Deſigns of our Redemption, and the purpoſe of our Redeemer, *John* 17. 21. Therefore St. *Paul* endeavours to perſwade the Churches where he had preach'd the Goſpel, to be of one Judgment, of one Mind, of one Perſwaſion, and of one Faith and Religion; and to the *Epheſians* he preſſes this Unity by divers weighty Conſiderations, becauſe there is but one Body, one Spirit, one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all. Schiſm is a Breach of this Unity, a Diſorder in the Church of Chriſt, a thwarting of his chief purpoſe in our Redemption, which is to unite us all together in one Myſtical Body his Catholick Church, and bring us at laſt to one bleſſed Kingdom of Heaven, where he is to Reign over us for ever. Now they who have a real Intereſt in this Mercieful

ful Saviour, and expect to be Partakers of and Subjects in that glorious Kingdom, should methinks joyn together now on Earth. None can be ignorant that this Union tends to the Honour of our Saviour, the Glory of Christianity, the Salvation of Souls, the Conversion of Infidels, and the publick Interest of us all, who have any Pretentions to Heaven, and the future State of Immortality. From these Considerations the Guilt of Schism may appear without disguise to be hainous, and is not so easily excused before God by the childish and vain Pretences of designing Men. Union amongst Christians is of that Consequence to the Interest of Christ and Christianity, that every frivolous Distaste or groundless Objection, is not sufficient to warrant a Breach of Unity, and cause a Separation; for unless we have plain Texts of the Word of God to justify it, 'tis a known Sin, which Men commit upon a bare suspicion of a deluded Conscience. That it is a Sin may be proved, First, by God's express Command to all Christ's Disciples, to *Endeavour the unity of the spirit in the bond of Peace*, Eph. 4. *That they may with one mind, and one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 15. 6. *That they all may be of one mind, and may live in peace*, 2 Cor. 13. 11. *That they may stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel*, Phil. 1. 27. And 'tis the Exhortation of St. *Paul*, Rom. 16. 17.

I be-

I beſeech you brethren, mark them which cauſe diviſions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are ſuch, ſerve not our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but their own belly, and by good words, and fair ſpeeches, deceive the hearts of the ſimple. Likewiſe to the *Corinthians* he ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. *Now I beſeech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that ye all ſpeak the ſame thing, and that there be no diviſions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the ſame mind, and in the ſame Judgment.* And he declares it to be a Mark of their Carnality, and of their being Enemies of the Croſs of Chriſt. By theſe and ſuch like Texts, we may underſtand, that Diviſion is contrary to the Mind of God and Chriſt, and that where 'tis poſſible to be united with the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, without contracting the Guilt of Sin, 'tis our Duty to joyn with them. Now there is nothing in our Communion, that can draw this Guilt upon ſuch as partake with us; for there are but Two Caſes which may oblige a Separation from a Church; the one when we are required to acknowledge ſuch Doctrines that we know by God's Word to be erroneous; another, when we are to comply with ſuch Practices, as are contrary to the Laws of God. A bare Fancy, an empty ſuſpicion, or a deceived Conſcience, which our Adverſaries commonly pretend for their Breach of Unity, are no ſufficient Grounds to violate

late the Commands of God in this Case. The Actors in the Gun-powder Treason, and the Popish Traytors, had the same Plea of Conscience, to justify and excuse their Conspiracies; and there is no Unjustice but may cover it self with this Cloak. Now the Scare-crows that fright these weak Souls out of our Communion, are the use of the Surplice, our Forms and Manner of Publick Prayers, the Ring in Marriage, the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, the Admission of Infants to that Ordinance, our Mode of Sprinkling, *&c.* Unless it be the Two last, which we have proved necessary, and of a Divine Institution, the others are in themselves indifferent. Now to comply with indifferent Matters can be no Sin; therefore to separate from us only for that reason, is inexcusable. And tho' some may pretend the Imposition of them by lawful and humane Authority, which to us the Members of the Church of *England* removes all Indifferency, but to others causeth them to be look'd upon as sinful, because they fansie them to be Additions to the Word of God, as they weakly pretend; and whatsoever Christ or his Apostles spoke in their Time against the Traditions of Men, and of the Ancient *Pharisees*, and of the Rudiments of the World, these prejudiced People often cite those Texts against our Religious Forms and Rites. Whereas we have as often declared them to be humane Injunctions, design'd by the Wisdom of our Rulers

Rulers for a more orderly and decent Performance of the Divine Service, and that they were never intended of themſelves to be equally valued with the Divine Laws or Articles of Faith. But ſince they have been appointed by our Superiors, to obſerve an Uniformity all over the Nation, in the Worſhip of God and other Religious Uſages, every humble Chriſtian thinks he owes that Deference and eſteem for the Prudence and Diſcretion of our Kings and Parliaments, as not to vary from their Preſcriptions; and we judge that in this Caſe we have divers Texts of the Word of God, to command and warrant our Obedience, as *Titus* 3. 1. *Put them in mind to be ſubject to principalities and powers, to obey Magiſtrates.* Heb. 13. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your ſouls,* &c. 1 Pet. 2. 13. *Submit yours ſelves to every ordinance of Man, for the Lord's ſake,* &c. Theſe and ſuch like Texts require our active as well as paſſive Obedience, to all ſuch Orders as are not contrary to the declared and plain Word of God: Therefore our *Anabaptiſts* are guilty of a Sin againſt God, by their ſeparation from us. And the publick Indulgence and Toleration granted to them leſſens not, but rather aggravates their Guilt; becauſe tho' the Government hath ſuſpended the Execution of all Penal Laws in favour of their perſwaſion, they are continually reflecting in Print upon the Rulers Eccleſiaſtical and Civil, and

and have adjudg'd their Baptiſm and Chriſtianity a Nullity. Chriſt in condemning the Traditions of Men, was ſo far from diſcrediting their Lawful Orders, that he hath requir'd our Obedience to them; the Traditions that he blames, were only thoſe that render'd the Laws of God of none Effect, and diſannull'd the Divine Commands. Ours, againſt which our Diſſenters quarrel, are not of that kind, but perfectly agree with the revealed Word of God.

Secondly, Separation from our Church, and the Schiſm of the *Anabaptiſts*, is a Sin againſt the Examples of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which we are commanded to follow. 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. and *Phil.* 3. 19. *Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk ſo as ye have us for an enſample.* Now what is the Example, that Chriſt hath ſet before us in our Caſe? He was, while he was upon Earth, belonging to the *Jewiſh* Church, and tho' he reproved many Irregularities and Corruptions, that had crept into it, yet neither he nor his Apoſtles would forſake their Communion, nor forbear the Practice of ſome things, that were of humane appointment and indifferent: Again, it was his expreſs Order, that as the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* were ſitting in *Moſes* Seat, tho' they were his Enemies, and both erroneous and vicious, yet he commands his Diſciples, *All therefore whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and do*, &c. Matth. 23. 2. He was Circumciſed

the

he Eighth day; He was Baptized by *John* ith *Publicans* and *Sinners*, and reckon'd that & as part of that Righteousness that he as bound to fulfil; he frequented their ynagogues and Temple; he observ'd their estivals and Paschal Lamb. And after his esurrection, for fear of giving offence, the postles kept external Communion with the *ews*, and oblig'd St. *Paul* to purify himself n the Temple, *Acts* 21. The Schism and eparation of the *Anabaptists*, is directly con-rary to these Examples of our Blessed Master nd his Apostles; for tho' they have not so uch reason as they had, to divide from the *Jewish* Synagogue, they add to the Crime of eparation the most scandalous and basest Abuse; they compare us to those Idolaters r Worshipers of the false Gods, mentioned *Cor.* 6. 16. which Command of God they ommonly quote, to justify their Separation rom us. Thereby let the World judge of heir favourable Opinion of us and our Re-ligion.

Thirdly, Their Separation is extreamly sin-ful, because of the many evil Consequences hat attend it; and because of the mischie-vous Sequels. Their Proselytes are thereby continu'd in their Mistakes and Errors, and are kept by them from the Grace of Re-pentance. Their Children that dye in their Minority, are excluded out of the Covenant of Christ, and their Salvation is very doubt-ful, having no visible Right to the Redemp-

tion

tion of Christ. By this Division the ev
Spirits of Hatred, Malice, Envy, Contentio
and Revenge, are entertain'd in their Breasts
and Charity, that Blessed Grace of the Sp
rit of God, is stifled and extinguish'd
their Hearts. I could reckon many othe
Mischiefs that this Sect draw upon themselv
and others, by their groundless Separation
which very much aggravate their Sin befor
God.

Now the Causes and Reasons they com
monly bring to excuse their dividing from u
are so weak, so frivolous, false, childish, an
ridiculous, that they deserve not to be men
tion'd. A Specimen of them we find in
small Pamphlet of one *Robert Cobb* of *Grave
end*, an Apostate from the Church of *England*
for these Reasons, as he says: Because th
Subjects of our Baptism come not as Chris
came to *John*, but are brought, and becaus
they go not into the Water, but the Water
is brought to them: Because we make all th
World, and Infants, Church Members: Be
cause we do not dip in Baptism, as he sup
poses *John* did; which I have proved to be
false: Because Children cannot perform what
is required in Scripture from the Adult be
fore Baptism: Because we celebrate the
Lord's Supper not at Night, nor sitting at
the Communion, but kneeling: Because in
our Litany we swear Eight times, when we
beseech Almighty God, *By the Mystery of thy
Holy Incarnation, by thy Holy Nativity and*

Cir.

Circumciſion, by thy Baptiſm, &c. Becauſe we have Ceremonies not commanded by Chriſt, amongſt which he reckons Surplice, cutting of Bread, Organs, Muſick, Impertinent Holy-days, Altars, Rails, *&c.* Becauſe God commanded his People to come out of *Babylon*, Rev. 18. 4. And ſuch like nonſenſical Grounds of Separation, that declare him, and a great many of his Fraternity, to be out of their Wits, or to be poſſeſſed with an evil Spirit of Error and Contradiction. The many Miſ-interpretations, and Miſ-applications of Holy Scripture, the Miſtakes and Falſities that this Man is guilty of in his Book, I think not worth mentioning; they are apparent to the Reader that underſtands ſenſe. We partly owe this Separation from our Church, to the ſubtil Endeavours of the Popiſh Prieſts and Jeſuits amongſt our Diſſenters, and partly to the Pride, Haughtineſs, Conceitedneſs of Men, and the late Anarchy. King *Charles* at his firſt Reſtauration adviſed with his Council, how to bring in the ſoberer Party of the diſaffected People: For that purpoſe he appointed divers of his reſtored *Biſhops*, to meet the *Presbyterian* Divines, and conſult about ſome means of an Union; Dr. *Morley*, afterwards Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, was one, from whoſe Mouth I had this Relation. When our *Common-Prayer* was in queſtion, and divers Exceptions were made againſt ſome Clauſes, it was then offer'd to the Adverſe

Adverſe Party, to compoſe other Public Prayers, and if they were better, and n Objections to be made againſt them, tha they ſhould be accepted. But the principa Cauſes of the Continuance of the Diviſion were the *Solemn League* and *Covenant* unt which many of them had been ſworn and tho' it was an unlawful Oath an Engagement, contrary to the Rights of th Subjects of *England*, and to the known Laws as our Parliaments have declared, they wh had been drawn into it, could not ſo ſpeedil yield to a Renunciation. Another Cauſe they were requir'd to be re-ordain'd by th Biſhops, and an Act paſs'd for that purpoſe This they look'd upon as a Renunciation o their firſt Ordination, and a publick De claration of their former Miniſtry to be null which would have given a great offence t their Auditors and People, and repreſented them to the World as meer Cheats and Im poſtors in Religion, if they all had complied as ſome did, to keep their Benefices. I at that Juncture Men of both Sides had not been ſo imperious, ſtiff, revengeful and untractable, if they had all ſincerely minded the Glory of God, and the Pub lick Union, ſome means might probably then have been contrived to put a Pe riod to all our Separations and Diſſen tions in Religion, which now are like to continue to the World's End, to the great diſcredit of our underſtand-

ing

ng Nation, and diſhonour of our Reformation, as well as to the Prejudice of Souls, and our Saviour's intereſt in the World.

Of Apoſtacy, and the Danger of this Sin.

APoſtacy is a Word of *Greek* Original, ſignifying a forſaking and falling away from any Party to another, and is commonly more ſtrictly underſtood by the ſacred Writers, in Caſes of Religion, for a Deſertion of God and his Church; a Deſertion of the Truth, to embrace a real or ſuppoſed Error, and joyn with that Number of Men, who make profeſſion of it; ſo St. *Luke* underſtands it, *Acts* 21. 21. where the Elders of *Jeruſalem* tell *Paul*, That they had been inform'd of him, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μώσεως, *That thou teacheſt all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to foreſake Moſes.* This forſaking of *Moſes* is named by the Evangeliſt *An Apoſtacy from Moſes*; becauſe thoſe *Jews* having been enter'd into the Legal Covenant, whereof *Moſes* had been the Mediator, they were engaged to obſerve all the *Levitical Rites.* Now the leaving of the Practice of that Religion recommended by *Moſes*, is ſtiled an Apoſtacy, and the Word ἀποστάτης, the guilty Perſon is interpreted by *Budæus*, a Deſertor of that Religion

ligion that he profeſſed, a ſpiritual Revolt from God. In that ſenſe we find the Ver to apoſtatize, *Heb.* 3. 12. *Take heed brethren leſt there be in any of you an evil heart of un belief,* ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, *in depart ing from the living God.* So 2 *Chron.* 29. 6 and 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. *In the latter days,* ἀποστήσονται τινὲς τῆς πίστεως, *ſome ſhall depart from the Faith* Likewiſe 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 3. The Defection of th Church of *Rome* from the Chriſtian Faith, i expreſly nam'd ἀποστασίαν, an Apoſtacy. Ac cording to the ſenſe of the Spirit of God in theſe Texts, Apoſtacy is a Sin more hainous than a bare Separation or Schiſm a Crime of a deeper die, that ſuppoſes Firſt that the Perſon guilty has been a Member and a Profeſſor of the Truth, that he a bandons; for Men may be born in a Schiſ matical Church, and may formerly have been Separatiſts, they can never be ſaid to be Apoſtates, becauſe they were always of the ſame divided Congregation. But as the Word implies a Revolt, they only can be charg'd with the Crime, who forſake their firſt Faith and Profeſſion in which they were engaged.

Secondly, 'Tis a Revolt, or falling away to a contrary Party, whoſe Principles are oppoſite to the former that they embraced, and to ſuch a Party that has renounc'd all religious Communion with our Church, and its Profeſſors. Thus the Church of *Rome* is accus'd by the Apoſtle, to have deſerted the

the Purity of the Goſpel of Chriſt, to fall away to damnable Deluſions, 2 *Theſſ.* 2.

Thirdly, 'Tis ſuch a Revolt, as to break of all Religious Communion with the former Church, and to be joyn'd with that Revolted Party, that is at an open Enmity and Defiance with our Church. Therefore it implies not a ſecret running away, but an avowed Rebellion againſt the Church of God and an open War that we declare againſt it and its Profeſſors and Principles.

Now divers of the *Anabaptiſts*, ſuch who have been baptized in our Communion, and admitted by that Sacrament to its outward Privileges, and who have ſince been perverted by the *Anabaptiſts*, and dipped into their Sect; ſuch who abjure us, and our Holy Profeſſion, and account of our Church no better than Congregations of Heathens and Infidels, as they have publickly proclaim'd in Print, I ſay ſuch Perſons are, without mincing the matter, Apoſtates from our Chriſtian Church, and by conſequence from the Catholick Church, whereof 'tis an Illuſtrious Branch. They have excommunicated themſelves from this Myſtical Body, and draw after them their unhappy Poſterity into this deluded Party, into the Devil's Snares. 'Tis not ſufficient, to pretend that they fall from us as a Corrupted Body; they ought to evidence this Corruption by undeniable Proofs, and plain Texts out of the Word of God, which they cannot do. And

we appeal to all the preſent Churches of Chriſt in the World, and deſire them to be our Judges, that if all thoſe Exceptions were really true, which I dare aſſert that they are not, but as I ſaid before, they are childiſh, frivolous, falſe, *&c.* They are not ſcriptural Warrants to break off Communion with us.

But ſome of this Sect proceed to the higheſt degree of Apoſtacy, that is, the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which I can prove many, not only of the *Socinian*, *Antinomian*, and *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptiſts* to have committed, but of the regular ſort. The hot and fiery Spirits do often blaſpheme our Miniſtry, our Prayers, Devotions, and whole Religion, and make it their buſineſs to diſcredit us, accuſing us to be Hirelings, and our Baptiſm, Chriſt's Ordinance, a Nullity, and all our, and the Biſhop's Performances, inſignificant. What other Blaſphemies have dropt from their Pens and Tongues, in relation to our Religion, I dread to publiſh, they are ſo odious: Therefore in reference to them we will ſpeak the Words of Chriſt, *Wherefore I ſay unto you, all manner of ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto men; but the blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven unto men.* For beſides their wilfull Apoſtacy, their embracing their pernicious Principles, their ſtiff adhering to this erroneous Party, we may perceive a deadly Hatred againſt us and our Church, which

which cauſes them to vilify us, and render us odious to their Proſelytes. This ſad and averſe Diſpoſition makes their Repentance more difficult, ſo that ſeldom we ſee any of them recant and repent of their Apoſtacy.

If any queſtion the Truth of this Charge of Blaſphemy, they may find it in Print, in the Sermon of one *Robins*, at the Funeral of Mr. *Gammon*, where he ſaith that *Faith, Repentance, and ſincere Obedience, is a Device of Satan, and an Idol of a Threefold Compoſition.* And in ſome other of the *Anabaptiſts* Books, we can find theſe Damnable Poſitions, *That God forceth Men to ſin; That it is his Will; That he ſees no ſin in his Elect; That no Wickedneſs can ſeparate them from God; That at the Moment they commit Murder, or any Villany, they are as acceptable to him, as when they are in the pureſt State of Life; That there is a certain part of Mankind condemn'd to be Damn'd; but that they alone are the Favorites of Heaven, and that they have no need to pray for the Pardon of their Sins.* They tell us, St. *James* was not Orthodox, when he joyns Faith and Works together.

I appeal alſo to the Diſputes between *Matthew Caffin* and *Thomas Monk*, and the Reflections of Dr. *Ruſſel* upon the *Goſwel-ſtreet* Meeters, and the Pamphlet of *Joſeph Taylor*, to prove by their own Con-

fessions, that some of their *Anabaptists are grievous Hereticks, Blasphemers of God and Christ, and that they are betwich'd by the Devil*, as any may read in a Book publish'd by *Thomas Monk* against *Caffin* and his Proselytes.

The

The History of the Anabaptists, *from their first appearance in the World till this Time, in Foreign Parts and in* England.

'TIS certain that this Sect of the *Anabaptists*, as we understand them, *i. e.* a Sect denying Baptism to Infants, pleading for the Mode of Dipping, as an essential part of that Ordinance, *&c.* is a New Sect, never known to the Primitive Church, nor to the following Ages till about the Year 1521, or 1522. Some before that Time might be for Re-baptizing of *Hereticks* returning to the Church, or *Apostates*, who fell in Times of Persecution; and others might cry down Baptism as useless: But I find no Record or History of former Ages, that mention this Sect, as 'tis now professed by them, before the Year aforesaid: When one *Nicholas Storke* first began of his own Head, without any Vocation, to Preach in *Germany*, and to gather Disciples. *Phil. Melanchton* makes mention of him, and tells us by what Arts he deluded the simple People: He pretended that he had Communication with God, by the intercourse of an Angel, and by Dreams; That he was promised the Place of the Angel *Gabriel*, and the Empire of the World; That he was appointed to be their Leader; That

his Saints should share amongst them the Kingdoms and Provinces, the Glory and Riches of the Earth; and, That he was commanded to destroy the Monarchs, Princes, and Nobles, and to reform the Church. Such wild and rebellious Insinuations and Notions being encourag'd by a supposed Divine Revelation, were greedily entertain'd by the necessitous Tradesmen, Artificers, and Labourers of the Country, who flock'd from all Parts to hear this New Prophet, that Preach'd many pernicious Doctrines, and amongst the rest, That Children were not to be Baptized. *Thomas Muncer* and *Phifer*, were Two of his principal Disciples, who proceeding after the Steps of their Master, took upon them the Ministry. *Muncer* set up for himself at *Alsted* in *Thuringia*, *Anno Domini* 1525. as *Lambertus Hortensius* witnesseth. At his first arrival he associated with the Tradesmen, and infected the meaner sort of People with his erroneous Principles, and with a dislike of the Doctrine of *Luther*, and of the Reformation. In imitation of his Tutor, he entertain'd his Hearers with his idle Dreams and Revelations from above, Preaching against a Propriety of Goods, Christ's assuming his Flesh from the Virgin *Mary*, his Divine Nature, the Satisfaction of the Cross, the Baptism of Infants, the impossibility of Salvation out of their Sect, *&c.* While he medled not with the

the Princes and Magiſtrates, and their Authority and Dominion, the Duke of *Saxony* ſuffer'd him to keep his Conventicle: But when the number of his Followers began to increaſe, *Muncer* adminiſtred an Oath to them, to aſſiſt him in killing the ungodly Princes and Magiſtrates. There was then a general Complaint of the grievous Taxes and Oppreſſions that were laid upon the common People, by the Princes and Lords of the Country. *Muncer* and his Followers took an Advantage of it, to inſinuate his rebellious Doctrines amongſt the Malecontents, promiſing them a Redreſs of all their Grievances, and the Goods and Poſſeſſions of the Nobles and Gentry, to make them amends for their former Sufferings, if they would afford him their Aſſiſtance, and embrace his Religion. The ſame Policy *Mahomet* had practiſed before him amongſt his *Arabians* and *Saracens*, in the days of the Emperor *Heraclius*. When the Duke of *Saxony* underſtood the Boldneſs and Deſigns of this New Prophet, and his ſucceſs, he baniſh'd him out of his Dominions: From whence he went to *Nurenberg*, a large and populous City of *Germany*; but the Magiſtrates there being inform'd of his Wicked Purpoſes, drove him out of the Town. We hear of him next at *Mulhus*, another Imperial City of that Country, where he Preach'd to a Congregation, and divers of his former Acquaintance reſorted

to him; there being encouraged by the Number of his Disciples, who esteem'd him as a Divine Oracle, he taught boldly, That all Goods and Estates were to be common; That Distinctions of Noble Men and Vassals ought no longer to be suffer'd; That they ought to be all free and equal; That it was not lawful for the Saints to obey the Civil Magistrate; but that they must establish a Kingdom amongst themselves, where Christ might begin his Reign on Earth. These and such other Doctrines being spread amongst the Peasants of *Suevia* and *Franconia*, many of them forsook their Husbandry and Trades, and to the number of 40000 took up Arms; *Muncer* and *Phifer* headed them. Their Beginnings were so successful, that being conducted by *Phifer*, they plunder'd several wealthy Towns, burnt the Houses, took Prisoners divers of the Nobility, brought into their Camp a great number of Cattle. This encouraged the neighbouring Country of *Mansfelt*, to joyn with these Fanatick Rebels, who march'd to, and took possession of *Frankhus*, a Town of *Germany*, where upon a Hill they encamp'd, when Count *Mansfield* with his Army overtook them. At the first Encounter the disciplin'd Soldiers had the Advantage of them, forced them to Retreat, and kill'd about Two Hundred; the rest barricadoed themselves with Waggons and Carts, with a Resolution to stand upon their defence

defence against the Count's Army, and the Princes his Assistants. But out of Compassion of the deluded People, they sent them a general Pardon, if they would deliver up *Muncer* and their chief Leaders; which they rejected, trusting upon the Dreams of their Preachers, and Assurances from them of God's Assistance, who had sent *Muncer* to be their Leader, and promised to him a notable Victory, and that his Righteous Followers should *wash their Feet in the Blood of the ungodly* that opposed them; so that when the Princes thunder'd against them with their Canon, they sung the Hymn, *Come Holy Ghost*; and expected that God would thunder upon their Enemies, and put them to flight, according to the vain perswasion of their Prophet. When no such help came from above, when their Carts were broken, and the Count's Army had forced in upon them, and slain Five Thousand, the rest trusted to their Heels and fled, some to *Frankhus*, others hid themselves in Woods, and convey'd themselves away, leaving their Prophet, with *Phifer* and Three Hundred more, to be taken and executed according to their Deservings. *Muncer* at his Death, could not make Confession of his Faith, he was so dejected; yet he spoke after the Duke of *Brunswick*. Now I cannot but here take Notice how Mr. *Stennet*, in his Answer to Mr. *Russen*'s Tenth Chapter, shifts off the Odium of this

Rebellion and mad Attempt from his Sect, with these Questions: *Is no difference to be made between the Innocent and the Guilty? Must the Crimes of a part be imputed to the whole? Is there any thing in the Opinion of those who are for Adult Baptism, to dispose them to Rebellion, or other Crimes, more than in the Opinion of those who assert the Baptism of Infants?* and, *Is it just to charge the greatest Sins on the most innocent Principles?*

Before I answer these Questions, I must inform Mr. *Stennet*, that in every Sect or Division of Men professing Christianity, there are Three things to be considered: *First*, The Doctrines and Principles of that Sect, which makes them differ from other Men call'd by the Name of *Christians*. *Secondly*, The Persons professing to embrace and maintain such Principles, and are known by such a Denomination agreeable to such Doctrines and Perswasion. *Thirdly*, A Spirit that influences the Professors of that Division and Sect, approves of and flatters them in their Opinion, whether it be Orthodox or Heretical. This Observation is grounded upon the Advice of St. *John*, *Ep.* 1. ch. 4. ver. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.* And upon St. *Paul*'s Information, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. *The Spirit speaketh expresly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed*

heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of Devils, &c. Therefore there is a Blessed Spirit of God, which leads his true Church and Elect into all Truth, and there are evil and pernicious Spirits of Heresy and Error, that possess the Minds of Men, and blind their Understandings, and govern their Wills; so that they are not able to see, repent, and forsake their Mistakes.

If any inquire what *Spirit* rules amongst the *Anabaptists*, and is proper to that Sect, I must freely declare my Mind, That it is a *Perverse, Imperious, Insolent Spirit* of Satan, the Enemy of Mankind; a *Spirit* of Delusion, Error, and Mischief; a *Spirit* of Schism and Division, not contented to perswade its Followers to separate and apostatize from Christ's Church, but also to separate amongst themselves, for the least difference in Opinion: And their several Congregations are so many Divisions and Separations. Now this Evil *Spirit* of *Anabaptism* has Seven wicked *Spirits* its Associates: 1*st*, a *Spirit* of *Hypocrisy*, which appears in their affected Behaviour, counterfeiting Sweetness and Charity, while in their Hearts they harbour nothing but Malice and Revenge. 2*dly*, A *Conceited Spirit* of *Pride*, that pretends to understand the Will of God better than all the Churches of Christ, and that prompts so many *Ignorant Fellows* to presume to, and invade the Ministerial Function. 3*dly*, A *Spirit* of *Enthusiasm*, which discovers it self in

in many of them, particularly in a certain Teacher in *Southwark*, who affirms that he was commanded to be dipped by an Angel that appeared to him. 4*thly*, A *Spirit of Ingratitude*, as in the old Generation of Vipers, that labours to deſtroy the Church of *England*, and undermine and blow up its Miniſterial Function and Government, that hath granted to it a Toleration. 5*thly*, A *Spirit of Unjuſtice* and *Robbery*, that would, if it had power, deprive all Perſons of other Perſwaſions of their Civil Rights and Eſtates. 6*thly*, A *Spirit of Confuſion*, *Cruelty*, and *Rebellion*; for tho' in their Confeſſion of Faith they profeſs Obedience to the Magiſtrates, their Practices have been rebellions in foreign Countries, and in this Land in the riſing of the *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptiſts*, and at the Invaſion of the Duke of *Monmouth*. 7*thly*, A *blind*, *ſtiff-necked*, and *Jewiſh Spirit*, obſtinate in its Perſwaſion, not inclinable to Repentance, but wilfully running on in the broad Road of Eternal Damnation.

Now to anſwer Mr. *Stennet's Firſt Queſtion*. As Faults and Crimes are perſonal, our Law condemns no Man till he is actually in Rebellion, tho' his Principles may incline him to a Revolt.

To the *Second*, The Crimes of a part may be imputed to the diſgrace of the whole, tho' not the Puniſhment; becauſe they entertain the ſame Principles and Spirit that prompted

prompted the part to the former wickedneſs.

To the *Third*, There is in the moſt part of the Perſons, tho' not in the bare Opinion of thoſe who are for Adult Baptiſm, a rebellious Spirit, a Spirit of Miſchief and Confuſion, that diſpoſes them to act over again the ſame Crimes, were they not reſtrain'd by the power of the Laws and Government, as I ſhall make it appear.

To the *Fourth*, He ſuppoſes his Principles to be innocent; which we have proved to be pernicious, and as thoſe Principles in others of the ſame Sect, have been active to the Deſtruction and Diſorder of Lawful Governments and Mankind, we cannot look upon them with the ſame favourable Aſpect as Mr. *Stennet* doth.

In quoting Biſhop *Jewel's Apology* againſt *Harding*, he condemns his Sect, for they were Enemies of *Luther*, as Mr. *Stennet* and his Party are of our Church of *England*. Whatever the rebellious Boors of *Germany* pretended againſt the Cruelty and Tyranny of their Lords, the perſwaſion of Chriſt's temporal Reign, and the wicked Principles which their *Anabaptiſt Teachers* inſtill'd into their Minds, inflam'd their Zeal to aſſault their lawful Governours; and tho' many of them may have been of other perſwaſions, their chief Leaders were *Anabaptiſts* long before, and they followed, and gave credit to the wicked Spirit of that Sect,

and

and to the Dreams and vain Revelations, that brought them at last to Destruction and Shame. Whereas Mr. *Stennet* saith, *Muncer had not Anabaptism chiefly in view; in the part he bore in this popular Commotion appears in that he died in the Communion of the Church of* Rome. I answer: 'Tis certain, Religion is often pretended by Deceivers, when they have least regard to the promotion of it; but that he died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* is not likely, for he could make no Confession of Faith without a Noble Instructer, the Duke of *Brunswick*, who taught him what he should say.

This popular Commotion in *Germany*, in which the *Anabaptists* had a principal hand, cost the Lives of several Thousands, perswaded by them to their assistance, to establish Christ's temporal Reign on Earth, in which the Saints, that is, those of their Sect only, were to bear Rule and Flourish. It was then suppress't by the Execution of the Offenders; but their poisonous Doctrines spread amongst the inferior People in divers parts of *Germany* and *Holland*. *Melchior Hopman*, a Person of some Learning, pretending himself to be *Eliah*, divulged his Errors at *Strasburg*; but he was by the Magistrates and Bishop confin'd to a Prison, and his Disciples scatter'd. But their Punishments discourag'd not some bold Spirits to tamper with the ignorant Vulgar, and

nd infect them with the ſame Principles. When their Numbers increas'd, they reſolved to begin their Empire at *Munſter*, about *Anno Domini* 1533; for that purpoſe there came to that City one *John Buckold*, a Botcher of *Leyden*, follow'd by a great Number of his Fraternity out of *Holland*. At their arrival they kept private Conventicles, and gather'd to them as many as they could perſwade to their Sect, and to be Baptized again. The Magiſtrates being jealous of their deſperate Reſolutions and Deſigns, baniſh'd them out of the City; but their Party amongſt the meaner ſort being numerous, they were received in again, notwithſtanding the Prohibition of the publick Authority. Their Excuſe was, *That they muſt not forſake God's Cauſe.* The Goſpel had been there Preach'd and received one year before, by many of the Citizens, when this ſubtil Fellow, *John* of *Leyden*, came to that Town. To gain Credit he conſorted firſt with the Preachers of the Reformation; but after he had prevail'd upon many to diſlike Infant-Baptiſm, he forſook them, and derided their Doctrine. The Landgrave of *Heſſe* ſent amongſt them *Fabricius* and *Bernard Rotman*, Preachers of the Reformation, and others, to diſcover to them their Errors, 1534. and perſwade them to an Agreement about Matters of Religion. To *Rotman's* Sermons, there was one *Hermannus Sutor*, a Cobler, a conſtant Auditor:

ditor: This Fellow declared himself to be a Prophet, the *Messiah*, the Saviour of the World, *&c.* He was as debauch'd in his Morals, as blasphemous in his Profession; this Man began publickly to oppose and ridicule the Preachers Sermons, and the Subject of Infant-Baptism, and to join with *John Buckold* in opposition to that Doctrine. They declin'd a publick Disputation, which was offer'd to them by the Evangelicks, and acted more privately in their Designs, drolling and jesting at all the Arguments brought to vindicate the Truth and Orthodox Perswasion. Divers of the Magistrates, and amongst the rest the Preacher *Bernard Rotman*, was perverted by them. They became so numerous, that one of their Prophets dared to run about the City crying, *Repent and be baptized again, lest the Wrath of God fall upon you.* They ventur'd afterwards to break open Houses, to plunder the rich Citizens, and to threaten to kill all that were not Re-baptized. This alarm'd the Protestant Party, who gather'd themselves together in that part of the Town that is named *Over Water*, where they stood upon their defence, till this Agreement was concluded between them: That all Parties should enjoy the liberty of their Religion, without any Compulsion. By this means they gain'd time to send to their Friends and Adherents round about in the neighbouring Villages, with speed to come to

Munster,

Munster, to the assistance of a Great Prophet, who promised them from God wonderful Advantages, That he would shew them the right Way of Salvation, and enrich them with the Spoils of the ungodly. These glorious Promises perswaded all the Idle, Indigent, Lazy, and Vagabond Persons, to flock in great Companies to the City; so that in few days it was full of those Strangers, by which means it was at the Devotion of the *Anabaptists*. As soon as they saw their Strength so considerably increased by such Numbers, they began first by the burning of St. *Maurice*'s Church, next they took possession of the Magazine of Arms and Ammunition; they proceeded to pillage and demolish other Churches; they ruin'd the Colleges, burnt a great Library, and at last drove all the Protestants out of the Gates, threatning them with Death, as wicked Persons, if they did not speedily depart. Those pious *Anabaptists*, who at the first behaved themselves humbly, and pretended nothing but Religion, Justice and Equity, nothing but Meekness, Charity, and Complacency, now, when power was in their Hands, broke through all the Rules of Humanity, and were ready to cut the Throats of them who had harbour'd them, and who were not of their Perswasion. Let the World judge if these Practices of the *Anabaptists* agree with Innocent

nocent Principles, for by their Works they are to be known.

After this Expulsion of the Protestants, *John* of *Leyden* awakes out of a Dream, in which he had continu'd Three Days, he pretended to be Dumb, and made Signs for a Writing-Table: In which he signified to them, That it was the Will of the Heavenly Father, that Twelve Men, by him then nominated, should be Governours of the City; That every Man should have liberty to enjoy more Wives than one; and afterwards he swore upon the Gospel, that this Doctrine was revealed to him from Heaven. Those who opposed this Motion he punish'd with Death; order'd the other Prophets to preach up *Polygamy*, as a Doctrine acceptable to God. He immediately married Three Wives, and all the Holy Brethren made haste to chuse for themselves the most Beautiful Women, with whom they Bedded without any Ceremony.

The next Motion that was made from Heaven, was that of *John Matthias*, a Baker of *Harlem*, who in God's Name declared, That every Man upon pain of Death, should bring forth all his Gold, Silver, and rich Movables, into the publick Treasury, where they had laid before the Spoils of them who had been baniſh'd. This Prophet proclaim'd also, that it was God's Will, that all Books should be burnt but the *Bible*,

Bible, in a publick Fire kindled for that purpose; and when a Citizen disliked his Revelation, *John Matthias* kill'd him. Some time after, in a frantick manner he took a Pike and sallied out of the Gates to encounter with the Enemy, crying out to the Citizens, That he was commanded by God the Father, to drive them out of their Camp; but the first Soldier he met slew him.

Another Prophet, *John Thuscocurer*, summon'd the Congregation together, and affirm'd, That it was God's Command, *That* John *of* Leyden *should be King of the World; That he should sit upon the Throne of King* David; *That he should kill all Kings, Princes, and Governours; destroy the wicked, and promote the People that loved Righteousness.* This Revelation was immediately obeyed, and *John* of *Leyden* proclaim'd King of *Sion*, with great Acclamations of the People, who harken'd to such Delusions and Lyes.

The New King appear'd in much State and Splendor in Royal Attire, made out of the Church's Copes and Vestments, with Attendants suitable to Majesty; his Horses had their Trappings of Gold and Silver; before him march'd Two young Men, the one bearing before him a *Bible*, the other a Sword. The Officers of his Court waited upon him, and himself wore a great Chain of Gold with this Motto engraven upon it: *Rex Justiciæ hujus Mundi:* The King of Righte-

Righteousness of this World. After him his Guards and Pensioners follow'd. Three times a Week he sat upon his Throne, to hear Causes: Under him sat *Knipperdoling* Governour of the City, and a little lower were his Four Counsellors. His Sentences were obeyed without controul, none daring to offend or contradict him. It happen'd that one of his Wives (he having then Married 153) had committed some offence, for which he was resolv'd to punish her, he brought her into the Market-place with all the rest, commanded her to kneel down upon the Ground, and with his own Hands cut off her Head in the sight of a great concourse of People. The offence, as 'twas reported, was for questioning the Truth of his Divine Revelations, and that she did not believe that it was the Will of God, that Men should be kept up there and starv'd. After Execution he made the rest of his Wives Dance about her, and give Thanks to the Heavenly Father, applauding his Justice for fear of the same Fate.

At another time *Thuscocurer* the Prophet, came to the King sitting in State upon his Throne cover'd with Gold, with this Message: *Thus saith the Lord, Go and say to the King of* Sion, *that he prepare my Supper in the Church-yard of the Great Church.* Accordingly under the Notion of a Communion a Feast was prepared of Three Courses. Whilst he was at Table notice being brought to him

him of one of the Besiegers taken Prisoner, he rose from the Company, and went and beheaded him as a Traytor. At his return, with his bloody Hands, he took upon him to administer the Communion, and caused his Queen, the chief of his Wives, with his Officers, to deliver the Cup with these Words: *Take, eat and drink, and shew forth the Lord's Death.* After Supper, the same Prophet delivers another Message to King John: *Thus saith the Lord, Chuse Men among my People, to send to the Four Quarters of the World, to teach all Nations the way of Righteousness, and to bring them by the Spirit of their Mouths into my Sheepfold, to do Wonders among the Nations, and to publish my wonderous things among strange People.* Eight and Twenty were nominated, of whom *Thuscocurer* the Prophet was one, and they were sent out by night as *Apostles* to the several Cities, to cry in the Streets, *Repent, or else you shall be shortly destroy'd.* They were all apprehended by the several Magistrates, and put to Death, to punish them for their Presumption and Folly. The City in the mean while was closely besieged by Count *Waldeck*, and in want of all Necessaries, Famine made them feed upon Dogs, Cats, Rats, Mice, *&c.* This moved the Princes of the Empire from the Diet of *Coblentz*, to write to the Citizens to surrender themselves; and *Hilversum*, one of their Prophets, being taken Prisoner, sent

ſent them a moſt pathetick Letter, to repreſent the hainous Crimes that they were guilty of, and how they had been deceived by a Crew of Fanatick Villains, who had violated all Laws Humane and Divine. But the King underſtanding of the Diſcontents of the People, weary of his Government and their Sufferings, made a Speech to encourage them to hold out, telling them, *It did become them, who were born again by a new Baptiſm, to be more patient in the Cauſe of God*; *That he was able to ſend them Manna and Quails from Heaven*; *That he had great Troops coming with Proviſions and Relief from* Holland; *And that at* Eaſter, *they ſhould be deliver'd from the Siege.* But this Prophecy proving falſe, Fifty Perſons attempting to let in Prince *Waldeck*'s Army were cruelly put to Death by this King *John*; nevertheleſs ſome of the Citizens got out to the Biſhop and the Prince, and having Articled for the ſafety of themſelves and the moſt innocent Party, they ſurrender'd the City into the Hands of the Beſiegers, notwithſtanding all the Reſiſtance of King *John* and the *Anabaptiſts*, who were kill'd where-ever they were taken, in Holes and Corners whither they had fled. The *King Knipperdoling*, and others, were ſeized, condemn'd to dye as Traytors, and executed in this manner: They were tied to ſeveral Stakes, and their Fleſh was pinch'd off from their Bodies with red hot Pincers by de-

grees

grees, and afterwards run through the Body with a Sword. Three of their Carcasses were hung upon the high Steeple of St. *Lambert*, in Iron Cases. *Rotman* despairing of Mercy run in amongst the Soldiers, and was there by them kill'd fighting. The City was taken after Eighteen Months Siege, in *June*, 1535. This was the End of the first King of the *Anabaptists*. As they aim'd at an Universal Monarchy, they had projected to surprise divers other Cities besides *Munster*; for that purpose *John Geles* was dispatch'd to *Amsterdam*, to publish to the People the wonderful Advantages of the New Kingdom of Righteousness at *Munster*, their Liberty of living upon the Spoils of Churches, and of the Wicked, the great Designs of their King *John*, and of the Prophecies, and likelihood of the increase and inlargement of his Dominions. At their Religious Meetings, instead of Divine Meditations, they were entertain'd with the rebellious purposes of robbing the Churches; of taking from the ungodly their Riches and Wealth; and how easy and feasible an Enterprise it was, to become Masters of the City of *Amsterdam*, which God design'd to give to their King *John*, as the first fruits of his Dominion over the World. To compass this Design, they resolved to kill all the Magistrates in their *Town-house*, when they should be feasting; to seize upon the Gates and

Strength

Strength of the City, and Plunder it. The Signal for their Rising was the Ringing the Town Bell, which could not be done, because a Drunken Fellow had taken away the Rope. This disappointed their Design, which was discover'd by some of their Companions; so that the Enterprise being not of God, but of Satan, the Author of all Error and Mischief, came to naught, and the guilty *Anabaptists* received from the hand of Justice their deserved Punishments.

These Executions discourag'd not this Sect from chusing another King of their expected Monarchy. He with his Treasurer was taken at *Utrecht*, and condemn'd to the Fire, not only for his Usurpation of the kingly Authority and Power, but also for Murdering a Mother his own Wife, that he might more freely enjoy her Daughter; for killing a young Girl, privy to the Fact, and for robbing Churches; much of that Plate was found in his Custody.

We have also an Account from the Translation of *Ch. de Nielles*, of another King of the *Anabaptists*, one *John Wilhemes*, an abominable Wretch, whose facinorous Deeds are there recorded. To him flock'd all those who had escap'd from the Siege of *Munster*. He removed his Residence from place to place, for fear of a discovery; sometimes he lived at *Louvain* or *Wesel*, at other times at *Alden*, *Culhar*, and *Harlem*;

He

He came to a fearful End, and was deſervedly Executed. This Fanatick King affirm'd the Doctrine of the *Anabaptiſts* preach'd at *Munſter*, was the Divine Truth, only able to bring Men to Salvation; and that God, for his demure and auſtere Life, had favour'd him with clearer Revelations than to other Men.

To him ſucceeded *Cornelius Appleman*, who was likewiſe puniſh'd by Death at *Utrecht*.

After him, *John Cordwainer* took upon him to be a King of this Innocent and Holy Sect of the *Anabaptiſts*. He was Executed at *Bruſſels*, for Robbing Churches, and Plundering the ungodly; for this was the general perſwaſion of all the falſe Prophets of this Sect, which they endeavoured to inſtill into all their Followers, That it was lawful for the Saints to take the Poſſeſſions and Eſtates of the Wicked from them; and that none ought to bear Rule or Authority but themſelves. All this, and a great deal more of their infamous Pranks, are recorded in the Writings of *Sleidan*, *Bullinger*, *Hortenſius*, *John Gaſtius*, and others, who have tranſmitted their Deeds to Poſterity.

Gaſtius informs us, That the *Anabaptiſts* ſpread themſelves in *Switzerland*, and infected many Families in the *Canton* of *Zurick*: But in regard they were ſo fond of Dipping, that Senate condemn'd their chief Teachers to be drown'd in the Rivers and Ponds, where they immerſed their Diſciples, A Puniſhment anſwerable to their

Crime! For at their first Appearance the Senate caus'd a Disputation between them and *Zuinglius*, a famous Divine, and they sat as Judges: At the conclusion they sentenced the *Anabaptists* to be in the Wrong, and the *Pædobaptists* to be in the Right; Therefore they commanded them to desist from spreading their pernicious Errors, while they continued in that Country.

Now Mr. *Stennet* endeavours to weaken the Testimony of these approved Authors, and to shift off the Odium of the black Deeds, that this Sect in its Infancy was guilty of, from the Name of the *Anabaptists*, and from such of them as live amongst us, by the following Insinuations: That the *German Rebellion* was justly occasion'd by the grievous Oppressions of the Princes and Nobility upon the common People, and not for Religion; That the Murders, Adulteries, Sacrileges, Thefts, Robberies, Violences, and Blasphemy, and other Villanies committed by this Sect at *Munster*, were acted by the Instigation, and under the Conduct of some designing Men; That the great Severites practised against the *Anabaptists*, provok'd them to the violation of all Humane and Divine Laws, and to the Tragedies that they perpetrated; That we are to suspect these Relations of these Authors as uncertain, by reason of the difficulty of knowing perfectly the things acted in Tumults and War, and also by reason of the Prejudices of those Prote-

Proteſtant Writers, who load them with Infamy, as the popiſh Monks did ſome of our Religion in the beginning of the Reformation; That ſeveral of the *Anabaptiſts*, as the *Mennonites* in *Holland*, condemn and exclaim againſt theſe Violences and Inſurrections, as contrary to their Principles; That many of thoſe who ſuffer'd for their perſwaſion, had no deſign to riſe in Rebellion; and, That the conſiderable Differences between thoſe foreign *Anabaptiſts* and thoſe in *England*, in Doctrine and Practice, hinders their Actions from reflecting upon theſe pious and innocent Souls amongſt us.

To which I anſwer: That by the Account that we have from *Sleidan*, and the Authors of thoſe days, the Religion, Perſwaſion, Revelations and Principles of the *Anabaptiſts*, had a principal hand both in the *German* Commotions, and the execrable Tragedies, and abominable Practices of thoſe of *Munſter*, as well as the Grievances of the People, that were by them pretended; That if that Sect were of God, no deſigning Men could perſwade the Profeſſors to Blaſphemy, Adultery, Rebellion, and to the publick Contempt of God and his known Laws; That no Severities have been acted upon thoſe *Anabaptiſts*, only for their bare Perſwaſion by any *Proteſtant Princes*, but by the *Papiſts*, and by their inſtigation, for which the former are not accountable; That no Perſecution, never ſo cruel, ought or could perſwade the true Followers of Chriſt, to ſuch black Deeds as are charg'd upon the *Anabaptiſts* at *Munſter*;

That their Proceedings in that City were ſo publickly known, that probably they could not be wrong'd in the Relations, that have been publiſh'd of them; That ſuch Perſons as have tranſmitted to Poſterity their facinorous Deeds, were Men not govern'd by Paſſion and Prejudice, as the *Popiſh Monks* and *Fryars* were, neither did they write their *Chronicles* from uncertain Reports of others, but from their own knowledge, being Eye-witneſſes to many of their Actions; and, That theſe Authors were Men of Reputation and Credit. That tho' ſome may be aſham'd of ſuch Wickedneſs, and their more regular Profeſſors may be averſe to ſuch Doctrines, the Infamy remains upon all thoſe who hold the ſame rebellious Principles, that prompted them to thoſe abominable Practices. And that the Differences between thoſe Foreigners, and many of ours at home in Perſwaſion and Principles are very inconſiderable, as we have taken notice in the Review of Mr. *Stennet*'s Anſwer on Mr. *R*'s Ninth Chapter. Therefore I muſt tell him, that theſe baſe and execrable Beginnings of this Sect affects all ſuch amongſt us, as are infected with the ſame Erroneous Tenents, and are ready to act over again the like Tragedies, if they had Opportunity and Power; for their Perſwaſion tends and leads them to the ſame Violences and Unjuſtices. Mr. *Stennet* pretends, that their Agreement with us in

the

the Mode of Baptism by sprinkling, causes them to differ from our *English Anabaptists*, and that he might therefore with as good reason, *report their Errors to the Defamation of the Pædobaptists, as Mr.* R. *does it to the reproach of the Anabaptists in* England. I answer: That this reason that he alledges to extenuate the Reflection upon him and his Party, is so far from lessening it, that it encreases and aggravates the Reproach: For if those Men of the *Anabaptists*, who differ'd from the Evangelicks in but one Perswasion, were tempted to Rebellion, and such Violences against them; what sort of Treatment might we expect from our Countrymen, who differ from us in more? who look upon us as Infidels? and declare us to be no Christians? But 'tis not by the Modes of Dipping or Sprinkling, that they were ever guilty of those hellish Practices of the Foreign *Anabaptists*; but their requiring all Men and Women to be baptized into their Sect, their Belief of Christ's temporal Reign, and that all ungodly Persons, *i. e.* all who own'd not their Sect, or were not joyn'd to it, ought to be dispossessed of their Wealth and Estates, and to be destroy'd, and that Authority and Dominion belong'd only to their Saints. These Tenents furnish'd them with a lawful Pretence, as they conceived to make Insurrections, and to new model the Church and the Humane World, according to their wild and fanatick Fancy.

And Mr. *Stennet* seems to approve of these Principles, by quoting Mr. *R*'s recounting amongst the absurd Positions of the *German Anabaptists*, *That no Person who is not a true Christian, ought to be tolerated in the Church.* He adds, *But he is not pleased to tell us, wherein the absurdity of it lies.* Is not this the innocent Position of our home *Anabaptists?* Don't they by declaring our Baptism a *Nullity*, exclude us from the Church of Christ, rank us amongst Heathens and Infidels, deny us any Right to the Redemption of Christ, and tell us in implicit Terms, that we are no true *Christians*, neither to be tolerated in the Church of God, nor in the Kingdom? What is the Consequence of these innocent and harmless Principles of this pernicious Sect? but Rebellion against the Government, and the Overthrow of the Civil Authority of the Nation, that is under the same Condemnation as the Church of God amongst us, that they have already abjur'd. If ever Opportunity should favour them, they would act here the same Tragedies as in *Germany*, and shake off all respect to our Governours and Government, as they have done to the *Ecclesiastick Authority* establish'd in this Nation, notwithstanding their Confessions of Faith, and Oaths of Allegiance; for we find the same evil Spirit of Disorder and Confusion reigning amongst many of these demure *Hypocrites*, as I shall prove

prove in the following Relation, of the Proceedings of this Sect, ſince their firſt arrival into *England*; therefore our Countryman Mr. *Sidenham*, had great reaſon to ſay, *Anabaptiſm hath been always ominous, and of a wonderful ſtrange Influence, accompanied with the moſt dangerous Retinue of Errors, ſince the firſt Embrio of it was brought forth: Whether from a Judgment of God, or from its natural and ſecret Connexion, with other Principles of Darkneſs, God hath ſhewed on it, in every Nation where it hath prevailed, ſome black Characters.*

Their firſt coming into *England* was about the year 1535. when ſome fled out of *Holland*, after they were diſappointed of their rebellious Deſigns upon *Amſterdam*. Here they were conceal'd for a while, till *A. D.* 1538. Theſe *Dutch Sectaries* endeavouring to draw to their Opinion ſome of the Inhabitants, they were diſcover'd to the *Eccleſiaſtical Courts*, and condemn'd to recant, and do Penance at *Paul's* Croſs; Four of them ſtood there publickly, with Faggots under their Arms, on the 24th of *November*. And in the ſame year, on the 27th, Two who refuſed to abjure, were burn'd in *Smithfield*. The next year, 1539, we read of Two *Dutch Anabaptiſts* executed in the ſame manner, in the Road leading from *Southwark* to *Newington*. Popery then reigning in *England*, would not ſuffer this Sect, but put the profeſſors of it to Death, as all

others that were not of the *Romish* Faith. The succeeding short Government of King *Edward*, that countenanc'd all those that were against the Idolatries of *Rome*, invited over divers of this Persuasion into *England*, where they had liberty to profess their Belief without danger; but the Persecution was revived against them in Queen *Mary*'s days. Mr. *Fox* makes mention of one of them a Prisoner in *Newgate* with Mr. *Philpot*, for disowning the Pope. To him that Martyr writes a learned Letter, recited in the Book of Martyrs, to prove to him Infant-Baptism, a Divine Ordinance, which prevail'd upon him to renounce his Error, and to dye in the same Faith with Mr. *Philpot*. In the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, 1575, at *Easter*, a Conventicle of *Anabaptists* was discover'd without *Aldgate*; Twenty-seven were taken, of whom Four recanted at *Paul*'s-*Cross*, the 25th of *May*, and the rest were Banish'd. Their Abjuration was in these Words: *Whereas we* ——— *being seduced by the Devil, the Spirit of Error, and by false Teachers, have fallen into these most damnable and detestable Errors: That Christ took not Flesh of the Substance of the Virgin* Mary: *That the Infants of the Faithful ought not to be Baptized: That a Christian Man may not be a Magistrate or bear the Sword and Office of Authority: And, That it is not lawful for a Christian Man to take an Oath. Now, by the Grace of God, and by the*

the Assistance of good and learned Ministers of Christ's Church, I understand the same to be most damnable and detestable Heresies, and do ask God, before his Church, Mercy for my said former Errors, and do forsake, recant, and renounce them; and I abjure them from the bottom of my Heart, protesting I certainly believe the contrary. And further, I confess, that the whole Doctrine establish'd and publish'd in the Church of England, *and also that is received in the* Dutch *Church in* London, *is found true and according to God's Word, whereunto in all things I submit my self, and will be most gladly a Member of the said* Dutch *Church from henceforth, utterly abandoning and forsaking all, and every Anabaptistical Error.*

This Abjuration was taken from these *Walloon Anabaptists*, by Doctor *De Laune*, my Grandmother's Father, who doubtless had been instrumental in discovering to them their abominable Heresies; he was then Minister of the *Dutch* Church in *Austin-Fryars* in *London*, granted to him by the Favour of Queen *Elizabeth*, being descended of an Honourable and Noble Family, and one of the chief Reformers of the Church of God in the *Netherlands*, who was the first Founder of the Family that bears his Name in *England*.

Others were Convicted of the same Heresy, and Banish'd out of the Land. Some were Burn'd alive, who obstinately persisted

ſiſted in their Error. This may ſeem very ſtrange, that Proteſtants ſhould inflict the Puniſhment of Death upon ſuch Offenders, for their bare Belief: But when we conſider the Circumſtances, we ſhall have reaſon to juſtify the Government of Queen *Elizabeth*, from any blame in that ſeverity; for in the year 1561, when ſhe underſtood of the firſt arrival of theſe troubleſome Companions into *England*, ſhe ſet forth a Proclamation, to command all *Anabaptiſts*, and all ſuch *Heretieks*, to avoid the Land within Twenty Days, whether they were *Engliſh* or Foreigners, upon pain of Impriſonment and loſs of Goods. This Proclamation was dated *A.* 1561. Therefore if Men will deſpiſe and act contrary to all Admonitions of Government, they are to thank themſelves for the Rigour and Puniſhment, for they knew what they were to expect by breaking of thoſe Laws.

The peaceable Reigns of King *James* and King *Charles*, gave theſe Sectaries an Opportunity to ſpread their pernicious Tares amongſt the common People, for they are a rampant Sect. We can hear no more of them till about the year 1642, when one *Edward Barber*, and *Lamb*, and ſome others, in the Beginning of our Civil War, declared a War againſt Chriſt's Church, by publiſhing their Impious Doctrines. About that time they challeng'd Doctor *Featly* in *Southwark*, to a Diſputation, where one

William

William Kiffin was the principal Manager on the contrary ſide, with Four more, of whom one was a *Scotchman*. The Doctor at that time laid their Errors open to the World in a Book ſince Printed, giving an Account of the Diſputation. But in the year 1644, they having deluded a number of our People, they had gather'd Seven Congregations, who ſet forth a Confeſſion of Faith, ſigned by Fifteen Perſons in the Name of the reſt. There were then Fifty-two Articles, whereas now they have but Thirty-two Chapters, with divers Poſitions then not thought upon. 'Tis obſervable that this Sect differs very much from the firſt Eſtabliſhment in this Nation, and all their Conventicles agree not amongſt themſelves.

The Civil Wars enſuing, gave them a favourable Opportunity to ſpread abroad their Errors, and ſecretly to work upon the weaker Sex. To prevent the Miſchief that they had begun, and were carrying on, Doctor *Burges* and Mr. *Bedford* publiſh'd Two Books in oppoſition to them; and Mr. *Winnel* another. They were then grown numerous in *London*, and in the Towns and Cities of *England*, having eſtabliſh'd an Order and Church-Government amongſt themſelves, which they obſerve to this Day. And becauſe about that time the *Presbyterian* Form began to be diſcredited, and the *Independant* was moſt in

Vogue,

Vogue, they resolved to Form their *Ecclesiastical Order*, after that Pattern. And in every Congregation they appointed one whom they nam'd a *Bishop* or *Elder*, instituting at the same time some circular Persons, who should have the Authority of *Apostles* or *Messengers*, as they name them, to visit and confirm their Churches. When Mr. *Baxter* was at *Coventry*, one *Coxe* came thither as an *Anabaptist Apostle*, to confirm, by the imposition of Hands, all those who had been dipped again in that City. At his second coming he was clapt in Prison by the Magistrates, sensible of the Mischiefs he had done there amongst the ignorant People. He publickly declared, *That the Ministers, being unbaptized, because not dipped, were no Ministers of Christ; that it was not lawful to hear them, or to joyn with their Disciples, tho' never so godly; because they were unbaptized Persons.* Which Doctrine began to make Men look upon one another as *Pagans*; so that the Re-baptized Husband would not joyn in Prayer with his supposed unbaptized Wife. What a woful Disorder and Confusion does this Doctrine bring amongst us?

The Jesuits at that time began to spread about the Nation strange Doctrines, and finding that this Sect might serve their wicked purposes, we find divers of that Fraternity in an eminent degree, as well as lower in the Army. They had poison'd a con-

conſiderable part of it with their infectious Principles, and with their Doctrine againſt the Baptiſm of Infants. Mr. *Tombes*, a Man of Learning, was then the Chief Champion of the *Anabaptiſts*, as Mr. *Stennet* is now; he was about the End of the Civil Wars. choſen Lecturer at *Bewdely* in *Glocesterſhire*. Then did Mr. *Marſhal* and Mr. *Blake*, Two worthy Divines, publiſh the Defence of Infants Baptiſm in Print. *Tombes* preach'd againſt them, and ſaid, That *Infant-Baptiſm pleaded from Circumciſion, as Mr.* Marſhal *had done, was an Hereſy, and one of the firſt condemn'd Hereſies of the Church.*

This Man muſt have a great deal of Impudence, to ſpeak ſuch Lyes in a Pulpit, and maintain them as Truths, before a knowing World. He had perverted in that Town about Twenty, who had been Dipped by him; but the reſt of his Congregation diſſatisfied with his Doctrine, deſired Mr. *Baxter* to agree to a Diſputation between them, at *Bewdley*, *January* 1. 1649. It continued from Ten a Clock to between Four and Five in the Afternoon; Two Reverend Divines were there preſent, Mr. *Boraſton*, whoſe Son, his Succeſſor, a worthy Divine, I have formerly known, and Mr. *Goad*. The Diſpute ended to the great ſatisfaction of the *Pædobaptiſts*, who were confirm'd thereby in their Religion againſt this pernicious *Hereſy*. Mr. *Tombes* after this, continued not long at *Bewdley*, by reaſon

reaſon of the little progreſs that he made there amongſt the People.

We find him next at *Abergaveny*, in a publick Diſputation between him and Mr. *Henry Vaughan*, and Mr. *A.* aſſiſted by Mr. *John Cragge*, the 5th of *September*, 1653. in St. *Mary*'s Church.

About this Time the *Anabaptiſt* Troopers would frequently climb up into Pulpits, with their Piſtols and Swords by their Sides, offer violence to the Pariſh Miniſters, and diſturb our Aſſemblies. In the year 1658. Judge *Hales* being in the Circuit, as I underſtand, an *Indictment* was brought before him, of ſome *Anabaptiſts* who broke into a Church at the time of the Holy Communion, and interrupted the Peoples Devotions; for which he reſolved to puniſh them ſeverely, but his Hands were tied by the Commanding Officers in the Army; for he ſaid it was very unreaſonable, that they ſhould crave Liberty and Toleration, who would not grant it to others. This Impediment and ſtopping of Juſtice caus'd him never to ſit on the Crown-ſide during that Government. By this Inſtance let the World judge of Mr. *Stennet*'s innocent Religion, Party, Principles, and Practices, how harmleſs they would be if they had Power.

At the ſame Time the *Anabaptiſts* were very buſie in *London*, to publiſh abroad their wicked Opinions. Mr. *Zachary Grafton*, who

who was one of their Chief Opponents, publickly confuted their Errors. At Six a Clock Lecture in the Evening, every *Sabbath day*, I heard him lay open at St. *Anthony's*, their Miſtakes. To revenge themſelves upon him, they publiſh'd Libels to defame him, and ruin his innocent Reputation. At that Time they of the *Fifth-Monarchy* Perſwaſion, had their Publick Meetings in *London*; but becauſe they exclaim'd againſt the Government of the then Protector, he ſent ſeveral times Troops of Horſe to diſturb their Conventicles, and carry away ſome of them Priſoners, becauſe they were Enemies of the Publick Peace: For tho' that Government agreed with them, and countenanced them, they were diſaffected to it, becauſe they were not Dipped into their Sect.

And 'tis to be obſerved, that tho' in their firſt Confeſſion of Faith they diſapprove of the payment of Tythes, and a ſettled Maintenance to Miniſters, divers *Anabaptiſts* were then, during the Anarchy, Beneficed in *England*, and took Tythes. But at the Reſtauration of King *Charles* the Second, an Act of Parliament excluded them from the Favour granted to others, upon their Conformity. Their Numbers increas'd ſtrangely in thoſe days, till the coming in of King *Charles* the Second, *A. D.* 1660. and the Reſtauration of the Government. They were numerous in divers Regi-

Regiments of Horſe and Foot in the Parliament Army; in *Cromwell*'s Regiment of Horſe, the chief Officers were *Anabaptiſts*; and in *Monk*'s Regiment of Foot, ſeveral turn'd to that Sect: Likewiſe in the Navy, *Mildmay*, *Aiſcue*, and *Harman*, and other principal Officers embraced it, being infected by *Paul Hopſon*, a noted Preacher in the Army, who ſign'd their firſt Confeſſion of Faith, and by others. 'Tis certain ſeveral *Jeſuits* came over into *England* and joyn'd with the *Anabaptiſts* about this Time, and Preach'd in their Conventicles againſt the Baptiſm of Infants, and the Mode of Sprinkling. What good can be expected from ſuch evil Agents, the Factors of the Pope and of the Devil, and Enemies of our Peace and Unity, let the World judge? And let our Adverſaries conſider, whether 'tis any Credit for them, to have ſuch Men amongſt them to promote their Perſwaſion, who come over with a Deſign to create Miſchief and Diſturbance, both in Church and State? Have they not reaſon to ſuſpect the Principles of their Sect, when theſe have been lately the chief Maintainers of it in this Nation? And I am credibly inform'd, that now there be many ſuſpected and diſguiſed *Papiſts*, who Teach in the Conventicles of the *Anabaptiſts*?

Now at the coming in of King *Charles* the Second, and the Reſtauration of the Govern-

Government in Church and State, they were very much offended, and the rather because of the Restauration of the Church of *England.* Their Dissatisfaction against the Royal Family, appear'd in the Rising of the *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptists*, the 6th of *January*, 1660. *Venner*, their Chief Leader, had sent to divers of the *Anabaptists* Meetings, to know whether they would joyn with him and his Party in that Design, to kill the King, his Brothers, and the General, and to reduce the Government to a Commonwealth, in which the Saints alone should Rule. I am told by one yet alive, that the Congregation whereof he was a Member, refused to unite with them; but they never offer'd to discover this Black Design to the Government, that had been mention'd to them. But 'tis probable that a great many of them being for Christ's temporal Reign on Earth, had promised *Venner* their Assistance, which they would not venture to give, till they saw how he succeeded in his Enterprise. He had never ventur'd with such a small Party as Forty or Fifty, to conquer the City and the Nation, if he had not had expectation of greater Recruits, from those of his own Perswasion. I find in the List of these *Fifth-Monarchy-Men*, *Kiffin*, who was at the Head of the *Anabaptists* in their Confession of Faith, 1644, and second in that of 1689. This I know, having discours'd with some of

of that Sect, that they are infected with the Hereſy of the *Chiliaſts*, as well as of that of the other *Anabaptiſts*, and it may be the moſt part of them are not free from this Error. Therefore we have reaſon to add to this Account of the *Anabaptists* Proceedings in this Nation, the *Inſurrection* of *Venner*, and of his *Mad Crew*, which may appear to future Ages as a Romance, had we not been Eye-witneſſes of their Bold and Raſh Attempt.

After the Reſtauration of the Royal Family, and the lawful Government in Church and State, the *Millennary* Men, who had before formed a Project of eſtabliſhing in *England* a Kingdom of their own Saints, and to deſtroy all that would not embrace their Perſwaſion and Party, were very much offended at this Revolution. They could not forbear to exclaim in their Conventicles againſt the publick Authority, branding it with Tyranny and Uſurpation, and inflaming the Auditors with a Zeal for Chriſt and his temporal Reign on Earth, againſt the Powers of the World. The Chief of this Faction, as I find recorded, were *Feake*, *Sympſon*, *Canne*, *Rogers*, *Brooks*, *Vavaſor Powel*, *Cockain*; and amongſt their Teachers were *Vane*, *Harriſon*, *Carew*, *Kiffin*, *Patience*, *Venner*, &c. Theſe had caus'd to be Printed divers ſeditious Papers full of Treaſon; Two were remarkable, call'd *The Valleys of Baca* and

Achor,

Achor, and the *Door of Hope*: The laſt was written by one *Righe*. By theſe and other Artifices they prepared and diſpoſed their Well-wiſhers for a Riſing. They ſent abroad their Emiſſaries, to draw into their Party as many as they knew or ſuſpected to be for a Commonwealth, againſt Kingly Government. But by this means it was firſt diſcover'd: One of theſe Agents invited one *Hall*, a Porter, with whom he had been familiar in the War in *Scotland*, to drink at a Tavern in the beginning of *December*, 1660. He inform'd him that there was a great Deſign on Foot, for the Good of the Nation and the well affected, and that he had obtain'd for him a Commiſſion for a Company of Foot: When the Porter enquired, For what purpoſe? It was anſwer'd by ſome in the Room, *We will pull* Charles *out of his Throne, with the reſt of the Family, and have the Blood of* Monk; *and ſettle a free State again, as it was in the Little Parliament: For the Saints muſt Reign.* The Porter promiſed his Aſſiſtance; but as ſoon as he was diſmiſſed, he diſcover'd the whole Project upon Oath to a Juſtice of Peace, who ſent him with his Examination to the King. Upon this Information one Major *White* was taken into cuſtody, who was prevail'd upon by the King to confeſs what he knew, and who were the Principal Men concern'd in this Buſineſs: He accuſed

accuſed General *Ludlow*, and Major-Genera
Overton; who in former days had ſaid
That he kept *Hull* for King *Jeſus*. *Ludl*
eſcaped into *Switzerland*, where he conti
nued till the coming in of King *William*
but theſe were ſeized, *Overton*, *Day*, *Courtney*
Major *Allen*, &c. who all belong'd to th
Army then disbanded. The Impriſonmen
of theſe Chief Leaders diſcouraged not th
reſt from their Fanatick Enterpriſe. O
Sunday the 6th of *January*, 1660. afte
their Meeting and Devotions were ended
they arm'd themſelves in *Coleman-ſtreet*
and went to St. *Paul*'s-*Church-yard* in th
dawning of the day; they there drew u
their ſmall Party, having placed Centinel
round about. One of them asking a Paſ
ſenger, Who he was for? Upon his An
ſwer, *For God and King* Charles, ſhot him
dead upon the Place. This Murder gave
the Alarm to a Party of the Trained-
bands, that charg'd them; but they re-
treating, theſe Rebels march'd through
Biſhops-gate-ſtreet out of the City, from
thence to *Cripplegate*, where they came in
again, and then to *Alders-gate*, where the
Conſtable's Company being weak, upon
their threatning him for the Keys, let
them out. Here they proclaim'd and de-
clar'd for King *Jeſus*, and their Friends
and Maſters the *Regicides* on the Gates;
from thence they went into *Beech-lane*,
where a Headborough offering to ſtop
them

them, was shot dead. They retreated next to *Cain-Wood*, to give time to their Friends to come to their assistance. And 'tis to be observed, that their March was cunningly design'd through the several Streets, where those of the *Anabaptist* Party, that believed the *Millennium*, or had promised them their helping hand, had Conventicles, and did there inhabit, that they might have opportunity to joyn them. Being driven out of *Cain-Wood* by a Party of Horse and Foot, they speedily, and as secretly return'd for *London*, *Thomas Venner* their Captain having assured them, *That no Weapon form'd against them should prosper, nor one Hair of their Head be touched.* This Perswasion embolden'd them to venture again in Arms the 9th of *January*, in *Thread-needle-Street*, where they forc'd to retreat a Party of the Trained-bands to their Main-guard, that march'd after them into *Bishops-gate-Street* again, where they enter'd into an Ale-house, known by the Sign of the *Helmet*, and after a sharp Dispute, Two being kill'd, and Two taken; and as many of the King's Party kill'd and wounded, their next Appearance was at *College-hill*, from whence they march'd into *Cheapside*, and so through *Wood Street*, *Venner* with a Murrion on his Head, and a Halbert in his Hand, being their Leader. Here they fought stoutly in very good order, with Two of the Trained-bands of Foot,

Foot, and with the Life-Guard, whom they forced to retreat; but the Trained-bands breaking in upon them on all ſides, knock'd down *Venner*, who had received ſeveral Shots; and *Tuſney* and *Crag*, Two more of their Chief Teachers, being kill'd at his ſide, the reſt fled and diſperſed themſelves; but the greateſt Number of them went down *Wood-ſtreet*, firing in the Rear at a Trained band of the *Yellow* in purſuit of them; Ten of them retreated into the *Blew-Anchor* Ale-houſe, near the Poſtern, where they defended themſelves till the arrival of Lieutenant-Collonel *Cox* with his Company, that ſurrounded the Houſe, ſome getting up to the top uncover'd the Tiling, where they fired in upon the Rebels in the Garret; and others getting up Stairs, having ſhot down the Door, enter'd upon them. Six had been there kill'd before, another refuſing Quarter was knock'd down, and ſhot dead. The reſt being demanded, Why they call'd not for Quarter? Anſwer'd, That they were afraid their Fellows would have ſhot them, if they had deſired any ſuch thing. Their Number not exceeding Forty or Fifty, cauſed many to ſuſpect, that they were promiſed from the ſeveral Meetings of thoſe who embraced the ſame Perſwaſion of a *Millennium*, a powerful Aſſiſtance. This *Hereſy* had infected a great Part of the late Army, who being disbanded, they thought would doubt-

doubtleſs joyn with them, in expectation of the great Advantages promis'd by their Teachers, who blaſphemouſly affirm'd, *That if they were deceived, 'twas God that deceived them.*

In this Inſurrection Two and Twenty of the King's People were killed, and as many of the *Traytors.* Some being taken, for refuſing to diſcover their Names, were ſhot. Theſe Twenty were arraigned at the *Old Baily: Thomas Venner*, Wine-Cooper, their Leader, *Roger Hodgkin*, a Button-ſeller, *Leonard Gowler*, *Jonas Allen*, *John Pym*, *William Orſingham*, *William Aſhton*, *Giles Pritchard*, a Cow-keeper, *Stephen Fall*, *John Smith*, *William Corbet*, *John Dod*, *John Eleſton*, *Thomas Harris*, *John Gardener*, *Robert Bradley*, *Richard Marten*, *John Patſhall*, *Robert Hopkins*, and *John Wells*. *Venner* and *Hodgkin* were firſt call'd, who after a rambling Diſcourſe pleaded not Guilty; but the Evidence againſt them was, That they did ſeveral times perſwade their Congregation to take up Arms for King *Jeſus*, againſt the Powers of the Earth; That they were to kill all that oppoſed them; That they had been Praying and Preaching, but not acting for God; and, That they Armed themſelves at their Meeting in *Coleman-ſtreet* with Blunderbuſſes, Muskets, *&c.* They were all found guilty by the Jury, and condemn'd to dye as *Traytors*, but *Hopkins*, *Wells*, and *Patſhall* were acquitted,

quitted, the Proof being not clear and positive against them. The Two first, *Venner* and *Hodgkin*, were, according to the Sentence, drawn upon a Sledge, on *Saturday* the 19th of *January*, from *Newgate* into *Coleman-Street*, over against *Swan-alley*, where was their Meeting house. *Venner* was first Executed, dying in the mad Perswasion in which he lived. *Hodgkin* raved and cursed in his manner of Praying, calling down Vengeance from Heaven upon the King, Judges and the City of *London*, till the Hangman was hasten'd by the Sheriff to silence him with the Halter. The rest were Hang'd in divers Streets of *London*, and their Heads and Quarters disposed of according to order.

Some time after these Executions, *John James*, by Trade a Small-coal Man, of *White-chappel*, and a Sabbatarian Preacher, in his Meeting-house was accused of treasonable Words against the King and Government, committed to Prison by a Justice of Peace, arraigned at *Westminster-Hall*, and condemn'd as a Traytor; he suffer'd the 27th of *November*, 1661. at *Tyburn*. At his Death he acknowledged his Opinion of Christ's temporal Reign, and said our Magistrates were Usurpers of that Power which was entrusted with the Saints, and confidently affirm'd the certainty of the speedy coming of Christ, and the accomplishment of the Glory of *Sion*, &c.

We

We may here obſerve, That this Sect as the reſt of the *Anabaptiſts*, give Liberty to any Tradeſmen to exerciſe the Office of a Teacher; That as they of *Munſter*, theſe are to ſet up the Saints only to Reign on Earth, and to permit none to Govern or Rule but themſelves, and ſuch as unite with them. And 'tis ſuſpected, That they all deny Baptiſm to Infants, as the reſt of the *Anabaptiſts* do. However, I find in *Bullinger*, *Oſiander*, and *Pontanus*, amongſt the Errors of the *Anabaptiſts*, the Perſwaſion of theſe *Fifth Monarchy-men*, *That before the Day of Judgment, the Church ſhall deſtroy all the wicked, and obtain a Monarchy, in which the Godly ſhall Reign alone.*

By ſuch Opinions and Proceedings, let the indifferent and judicious World judge what eſteem we are to have of the *Anabaptiſts* amongſt us, and of their Principles and Doctrines. However, we have ground to believe, that their Intentions are not ſo favourable and kind to us as they pretend, ſince by their Confeſſion of Faith, they wound us in the moſt ſenſible Part of our ſelves; and tho' they live under the Protection of our Governours, they dare publiſh abroad, that they are no Chriſtians, and deprive us all who are not Dipped, of the Honour and Privileges of our Chriſtian Religion, upon which we value our

ſelves, more than upon any earthly Enjoyment. And as they pretend and plead for Liberty of Conſcience for themſelves, they ſhould be ſo gracious to allow it to thoſe under whoſe Dominion they are ſhelter'd. They ſhould conſider that our Judgment and theirs do not agree, and we cannot ſo eaſily be perſwaded to deprive our Infants of their Church Privileges as they are, and that we look upon Sprinkling to be ſufficient, and are ſatisfied, that Mode of Adminiſtration anſwers Chriſt's Inſtitution; and that to ſentence Peremptorily all that are not Dipped out of the Church. not belonging to the Redemption of Chriſt, or to eternal Damnation, is a Doom as deſperate, bold, and raſh, as the Inſurrection of the *Fifth-Monarchy-men* was, and as cruel and barbarous, if not worſe, and more inhumane; for thoſe intended only to take from us our Lives and Wealth, but theſe condemn us to everlaſting Flames, and by a Barbarity not to be parallell'd, but by the Anti-chriſtian Pride and Preſumption in their Opinion, exclude us out of Heaven, and condemn us to Hell, in imitation of the *Papiſts*, for not being of their Sect. How innocent and charitable thoſe Principles are, and what we are to expect from their Goodneſs and pretended Chriſtianity, if they had Power in their Hands, let the World judge. We need not bring the Treaſonable Practices

of

of their Brethren without and within the Kingdom, their Adulteries, Murders, and filthy Actions, the Disorder and Feuds of Families, to discover them in their own colours. Look into their Principles and Perswasion, there you shall find, without enquiring any further, the Devil conceal'd under the Garb of an Angel of Light; for if we add to the former evil and direct Consequences of their Principles and Doctrines, which Mr. *Stennet* pretends are so innocent and harmless, what we have already examin'd, the Mischiefs of depriving our Infants of their Right to Christ's Covenant and Kingdom, of their excluding them from their Entrance into it, of leaving them in the polluted State of Nature, without God and a Redeemer, and under the Empire of Satan, and without any Assurance of Mercy and Salvation, with the dismal Sequels of such Proceedings and Opinions, Can any Rational Being pronounce them to be innocent or tolerable? Is there any Sect amongst us more pernicious to the Church, more dangerous to our Salvation, more injurious to our Redeemer, and more destructive to his Interest, than this of the *Anabaptist Dippers?* And it deserves our Observation, how these *Anabaptists* in the Fifth Article of their Confession of Faith, Printed 1644. charge the Episcopal Order of those days, with-

out any just Cause, with Tyranny, and applaud their Exclusion out of the House of Lords in these Words: ——— *The Tyranny and Oppression of the Prelatical Hierarchy, which God through Mercy hath made this present King and Parliament, wonderful Honourable, as an Instrument in his Hand to throw down.* By these Expressions they declare themselves Enemies of the Episcopal Order and Function. And is this the Innocency of this Generation of Vipers, of which Mr. *Stennet* so often boasts. 'Tis likewise remarkable, how they have alter'd their Confession of Faith according to the Times. In the first they allow no Tithes, nor legal Maintenance to the Ministry, but such as is free, and at the pleasure of the People; but in the latter they omit that Stumbling-block, because divers of them are now Proprietors of Tithes; and they are in hopes, when their Numbers increase, to allot that Maintenance to their Teachers. Thus worldly Interest, which altogether governs this Sect, hath caus'd them to leave out this Article in their second Confession. We may likewise observe, that their Confessions agree not, as that of 1663. presented to King *Charles* the Second, with Two others, that of 1678. subscribed by Fifty-four Messengers, *&c.* and that of 88. of the particular Baptists.

Now

Now King *Charles* and his Council, conſidering how theſe wicked Men, under a Pretence of Religion and Conſcience aſſembled to diſturb his Government, and the Peace of the Kingdom, publiſh'd a Proclamation, to forbid all religious Exerciſes in Conventicles or Meeting-houſes, other than in the Churches and Chappels appointed for that purpoſe, under the Penalty of being proſecuted for Rioters. For that intent he commanded all Juſtices of the Peace, and other Magiſtrates, to ſuppreſs ſuch Aſſemblies, and to deal with the Offenders according to Law; but this Prohibition, and the Severities practiſed againſt them, hinder'd them not from their wonted Conventicles, which they frequented more privately ſtill, continuing to ſpread their Errors among the common People, till the Death of King *Charles*, and the Acceſſion of his Brother King *James* to the Throne and Crown of *England*. At the beginning of whoſe Reign, the Duke of *Monmouth*, the Lord *Gray*, and about Eighty-two Perſons more of their Followers, Landed at *Lyme*, from *Holland*. This Duke had been in his Father's days the Idol of all Diſſenters, and eſpecially of the *Anabaptiſts*, who were wont to magnify his Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Courage, and other Abilities, and ſecretly to whiſper his Right of Succeſſion to the Crown, by reaſon of a pretended private Marriage of his Mother to the King. To

prevent the Danger of ſuch Pretentions, his Majeſty was forced to diſclaim it publickly. However this raſh Duke attempted to invade the Kingdom with his ſmall Party, and to march to *Taunton* in *Sommerſetſhire*, where the *Anabaptiſts* and other Diſſenters increas'd his Numbers to ſeveral Thouſands in or about Ten days time. 'Tis incredible how forward they were at firſt, to Liſt themſelves under his Banners; but when he ſuffer'd himſelf to be proclaim'd King, by an over zealous and affectionate Party, contrary to his Agreement with the Earl of *Argile*, the *Fifth-Monarchy-Anabaptiſts*, who would have none to Reign but King *Jeſus*, and the Members of their Sect, became more cool and leſs zealous for his Intereſt. From *Taunton* he march'd to *Bridgwater*, from thence, in ſight of *Briſtol*, through *Wells*, to *Philips-Norton*. The innocent *Anabaptiſts* of his Army, committed ſeveral Diſorders in the *Cathedral* of *Wells*, they ſhot Bullets through the Organs, and were going to deface that Houſe of Prayer, had not the Lord *Gray* haſten'd to reſcue it from their ungodly and ſacrilegious Hands. At *Phillips-Norton* they were met with, by a Party of the King's Subjects and Soldiers, commanded by the Lord *Churchill*, now Duke of *Marlborough*, by the Earl of *Feverſham*, Collonel *Kirk* and others, with whom the late Biſhop *Mew* joyn'd. The Rebels were there forced to retreat

retreat back to *Bridgwater*, being purſued by the Royaliſts, who pitch'd their Tents, about the 11th of *July*, *Anno Domini* 1685, in *Weſton-Moor*, facing the Town of *Bridgwater*. The Camp had the Village of *Weſton* in their Backs, and before them a ſmall Ditch of Water, not fordable in Winter, but then paſſable on Horſe-back. The Duke, in the Evening, of the Night that he deſign'd to beat up their Quarters, went up to the Church as high as he could, to take a View of them, and diſpoſed of all things for an Encounter: He order'd the Lord *Gray*, who commanded the Horſe, to march at the Head of his Party, and enter the *Moor*, not the ſtrait Road, but through the Pariſh of *Chedſey*, a little about, all his Infantry follow'd, and were drawn up by Major *Holmes* and other Commanders. At the firſt Entrance into the *Moor*, one Collonel *Hucker* ſhot off his Piſtol, which gave the Alarum unto the King's Soldiers, who were all ſleeping ſecure in their Tents, never dreaming of a Camiſade; and the Horſe-men were in the Farmers Houſes in their Beds, their Horſes unſadled in the Stables and Barns. So that if the Duke's Horſe under the Lord *Gray*, had made ſpeed into the Town of *Weſton*, they might have ſurpriz'd all the Horſe and Horſemen, and fallen upon the Back of the Foot, and taken all their great Guns, with which they did afterwards great Execution. But

the Lord *Gray* with his Cavalry rode up and down, without ſtriking a ſtroke, and left the Foot to fight the Battle. At the firſt beginning of the Alarm Biſhop *Mew*, then elect Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, being apprehenſive of the Duke's Deſign was watchful, and reading in the Vicar's Houſe of *Weſton*; he quickly haſten'd to the Cannon, where, with his Coach-horſes, he turn'd them from the ordinary Road, towards *Bridgwater*, towards *Chedſey* and *Monmouth*'s Infantry, and gave fire to the firſt Gun, with this ſaying, *My Bleſſing go along with it.* The Duke's Foot ſtood firm while the Night cover'd them; but the Duke and the Lord *Gray* with all the Horſe, being fled towards *Axbridge*, and *Mendip-hills*, and diſperſed, they began to ſhift for themſelves at the dawning of the Day. I being then an Inhabitant of that Country, I know theſe Particulars to be true, and that ſeveral *Anabaptiſts* out of *Taunton*, *Frome*, and other Places, caſt themſelves into the Duke's Army, and were afterwards condemn'd by Judge *Jefferys*, and Executed.

And to ſhew what hand that Sect had in this Tumult, and ſhort liv'd Rebellion in and about *London*, in their Meetings they began to conſult, what Aſſiſtance they ſhould be able to give to the Duke, if he had any ſucceſs. And I am credibly inform'd, that they began to make a Purſe by voluntary Contributions of the wealthieſt of the *Anabaptiſts.*,

baptists, to raise Troops of Horse to help him, if Opportunity gave leave; and that their Resolution was never to lay down their Arms until their Religion was uppermost, and until they had brought the Saints to Reign alone. But God disappointed these their glorious Designs and mighty Projects, by the rout of the Duke's Army, and the loss of his Head upon *Tower-hill*.

It may be acceptable to the Publick, if I give here a further Account of several Particulars of this rash Invasion, in which the *Anabaptists* had a great hand to encourage it, and if it had prosper'd, they were resolved to send *Monmouth* Twenty Thousand Men to assist him, after they had computed their Strength and Numbers. Divers Passages between his Landing and Execution, deserve to be transmitted to Posterity. When the Mayor of *Lyme* saw how willing his Townsmen were to receive and welcome the Duke, he fled with the Minister, and sent word to the King of his Arrival. There was then some of the publick Money, which was taken and converted to the Duke's Use. A certain Neighbour Gentleman, more zealous for him than wise, sent to welcome him into the Land, with the Present of a fine Horse, which proved fatal to him and his Family; and to Mr. *Dare* of *Taunton*, to him and his Family; for to purchase his Pardon afterwards from King *James*, he was oblig'd to

pay to Judge *Jefferies*, then Lord-Chancellor, ſome Thouſands of Pounds. This Horſe was the occaſion of the Death of Mr. *Dare*, then made Collonel of a Goldſmith, by the Duke; for contending with another Gentleman for the Horſe, which had been given to him by *Monmouth*, he was ſhot in the Head, and died immediately.

At the publiſhing a Declaration againſt the King, which reflected much upon his Honour and Right, the Country came in to his Aſſiſtance; ſo that in his March, and at the firſt Appearance of his Men on the top of the Hills, Collonel *Lutterell*'s Regiment of the Militia fled away, and could not be perſwaded by their Officers to ſtand; for Fame had magnified the Number of the Enemies Forces, to terrify and draw the Country to his Aſſiſtance. And the Muſter-Maſter Captain *L—il—t—n*, advancing before the Regiment as a Scout, diſcover'd ſome few of the Duke's Men at a diſtance, which caus'd him to Gallop back to his Party, crying out, *Gentlemen, ſave your ſelves, for the Enemy is coming.* At which Words they fled towards *Taunton*, and ſome caſt away their Arms and Coats, to make their way more ſpeedily through Corn-fields. The Duke followed them with his ſmall Party, not above Three Hundred Men. The Lord *Gray* rid before him, with a Sword in one Hand and a Bible in the other, when they came to *Taunton*; where

where the People welcom'd him with loud Acclamations, and other Signs of Joy. A certain Quaker of the Town came to see him, with these Expressions, *Thou art come to preserve the Gospel, I hear it is not yet taken away from us; thou art come too soon.* The People had swept their Streets, and spread sweet Herbs and Flowers in his way to Mr. *Hucker*'s House, where the Duke took up his Lodging. He was to have been Commissary-General of Provisions, in his Army.

Now the flight of the Militia Regiments, and the unconcernment of the *Devonshire* Forces, under the Duke of *Albemarle*, at the March of the Duke of *Monmouth*, so encourag'd the Townsmen and Country to list themselves, that it is confidently reported, that he had in a few days about Nine or Ten Thousand Men. The Minister and several of the Loyal Party, were fled out of Town; and divers neighbour Ministers left their Dwellings, for fear of the Insolence and Abuses of these new raised Soldiers, who search'd all round the Country for Horses, Arms, and Ammunition, which they carried away without the Owners leave. None were more insolent and insulting than such as were of the *Anabaptist* Perswasion: One among the rest meeting a Minister going to his Devotions, offer'd to scoff at the Prayers of our Church, by saying, *I warrant you, you are now going to say, Lord have Mercy upon us.* It

was

was answer'd boldly to that Wretch, *Mercy will shortly be the best thing you can desire and crave.* The *Taunton* Virgins offer'd amongst the rest, to shew their Affection to the Duke, Twenty-six of them having prepared him Standards and Colours, and wrought his Name in one in Gold, with the Addition, *King of England*, carried them to him through the Town, to a Meadow near *North gate*; they were led by a Daughter of Collonel *Buffet*, who had a Sword in one Hand, and a *Bible* in the other, and were kindly receiv'd and saluted by the Duke. But when he saw neither Clergy nor Gentry come in to him, he was discouraged; yet he was prevail'd upon to proceed on, upon Intelligence, the 20th of *June*, That Collonel *Kirk* with his *Tangerines* were at *Chard*, and stop'd his Retreat. It was then *Sunday*, and *Ferguson* was to Preach before him, as he had done the *Sunday* before, upon the 20th of *Deut.* 3, 4, Verses. This News made him hasten to *Bridgwater*, and from thence towards *Wells* and *Shipton-Mallet*. The Duke of *Beaufort* with a strong Party had taken possession of *Bristol*; and when *Monmouth* demanded Entrance into *Bath*, they shot and kill'd his Trumpeter that he sent. At *Cannesburnbridge* an unknown Hand discharg'd a Gun at the Duke, and desperately wounded the next Man to him. The King's Army met and encounter'd the Rebels at *Philips-Norton*, where the

the Duke of *Grafton* advancing with his Company unadviſedly, in a Lane lined on both Sides by the Duke's Men, loſt Twenty-ſeven of his beſt Soldiers. The *Monmothians* were in the lower Ground amongſt the Hedges, where they had planted their Canon, with which they annoy'd the King's Forces, who were drawn up in a higher Ground. Tho' the Duke loſt not many Men, nor near ſo many as his Enemies, he was here ſtop'd, and reſolv'd to return back with all ſpeed. As he retreated through *King Sedgmore*, he found about a Thouſand Clubmen up in Arms, commanded by one *Plays*, a *Quaker*, who was invited to joyn with him; but hearing of the coming of the King's Forces, was diſcouraged, and diſperſed his Men to their ſeveral Habitations.

The Badge and Cognizance of the Duke's Men was a Green Bough, as that of the King's was a White Paper; and the Word of diſtinction of the Duke's Side was, *God on our Side and no Quarter*, as on the King's was, *Whitehall and no Quarter*. The fight in *Weſton Moor* between the Foot, laſted about Two Hours: In which time about Fifty were killed, beſides the Wounded. As ſoon as the Day appeared, the Duke with a Party of Horſe was fled towards *Axbridge*, and that Way up to *Mendip*, and all the Rebels diſperſed. Their Carriages were taken near the *Moor* and Plunder'd. The Duke was made

made Prisoner about *Ringwood*, and from thence, with the Lord *Gray*, convey'd to the *Tower* of *London*, and from thence to the Scaffold on *Tower-hill*, as the World knows. I am sensible that some of the *Anabaptists* now will deny, that their Sect had any hand in this Insurrection; but 'tis to be proved by the Number of those who suffer'd in the *West* of that Perswasion, by what Mr. *Wall* in his *History of Infant-Baptism*, hath taken notice of their former Resolution, to assist the Duke with Twenty Thousand Men, whereof One Thousand Five Hundred were to be Horse. And 'tis an Evidence sufficient to the World, how much this Sect was concern'd in that Invasion, by a certain Book Printed by them, call'd *The Bloody Assizes*, where the Romantick Author speaks of them as Blessed Martyrs, who suffer'd for their Rebellion against their lawful Prince, and brings them into the Catalogue with those innocent Persons, who were unjustly put to Death in King *Charles*'s Reign, by the violence of a prevailing Party. All, or most of their Speeches, are forged; and I can assure the World, that many of them never died with that Christian Resolution, and those pious Sentiments that are ascrib'd to them in that Book, Printed by the *Anabaptists*.

Now the Papists having an Intention to ruin the Church of *England*, and to introduce

duce Popery, perſwaded the King to ingratiate himſelf with all Diſſenters, particularly with the *Anabaptiſts*. Unto whom he gave a plenary Indulgence, to ſet up as many Conventicles as they pleas'd, by his Royal Declaration for Liberty of Conſcience; but that being oppoſed with the Abrogation of the penal Laws and the Teſt, by our worthy Biſhops, Nobility, and Gentry, he took ſuch unadviſed Methods next, as open'd the Eyes of the Nation, and cauſed the following Revolution, that ſettled King *William* and Queen *Mary* upon the Throne, and the Succeſſion in the Proteſtant Line of the Royal Family.

In the Firſt Year of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, an Act of Parliament granted to all Diſſenters from our Church, an unlimited Toleration. This gave liberty to the *Anabaptiſts*, to ſtrengthen their Party by the Acceſſion of divers ignorant and unadviſed People to their Sect, who have been perſwaded to be Dipped by them, and by that Ceremony to engage themſelves the more to their Intereſt. In the Year 1689. there was a general Meeting of them, to conſult of their Affairs, and to publiſh a Confeſſion of Faith, in which they agree with moſt of our Diſſenters, but in the Subjects and Mode of Baptiſm. They borrow from the *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, their chief Articles,

and

and make their Separation and Churches altogether conformable to the Practice of the latter. Their Conſultation continued Eight or Nine Days, from the Third of the Seventh Month to the Eleventh, 1689. as they affectedly expreſs themſelves. It ſeems there were the Miniſters and Meſſengers of upwards of one Hundred Congregations in *England* and *Wales*. In this Confeſſion they ſhew a Conformity in moſt Articles with the Orthodox Chriſtians, yet we have reaſon to ſuſpect it to be but a *Blind*, to deceive the World, and to procure a favourable Opinion to the Profeſſors of the Dipping Sect; for many of them diſagree, both in Belief and Practice, in divers Poſitions, with the Doctrines there ſet down, as in *Original Sin*, the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, and the Civil Magiſtracy now eſtabliſh'd, unto which many are no cordial Friends; for they would have none but the Saints to have liberty to Reign; and are of Opinion, *That Dominion is founded in Grace*. Now what Opinion are we to entertain of a Sect, that is divided into ſo many Heretical Perſwaſions, ſo contrary to the Being of Chriſtianity? What Opinion are we to have of a Sect, that threatens all Men that joins not with them, with eternal Damnation, and offers to deprive us of our Right to our Honours, Command and Eſtates? Their Behaviour and Carriage

Carriage amongſt us, at preſent, is contrary to this Character. Why? Becauſe they dare not act otherwiſe; their Power anſwers not yet their Will and Principles; the Laws of the Land, and the Authority of the Nation, keep this unruly and pernicious Sect in Awe. But by their ſecret Actings, by their Dealings, and overthrow of all Lawful Miniſtry, we may eaſily gueſs at their future Proceedings, if they had Liberty and Power: In all Parts of the Nation they ſpread their Infection, and increaſe amongſt the ſimple and ignorant. It concerns therefore all Miniſters and Magiſtrates, who love the Welfare of Souls, and the Preſervation of the publick Peace of the Nation, to have an Eye to the ſecret Actings of this Sect, to put a ſtop to their Pride and Preſumption, and to endeavour to undeceive their deluded Diſciples.

This Sect now runs into the ſtrangeſt Confuſions and Diviſions amongſt themſelves, according to the old Proverb, *Give ſome Men Rope enough, and they will hang themſelves.* But that which the Government ſhould take notice of, they have their Quarterly Meetings, and every Year their frequent general Aſſemblies in *London*, from all Parts of *England*, where their Numbers, Strength, and Power, is computed, and Meaſures taken, not only againſt

againſt the Church of *England*, and for the propagating their Hereſy, but to ſettle and ſecure their temporal Intereſt in the World.

'Tis likewiſe to be obſerv'd, that the Dictates and Reſolutions of theſe Aſſemblies, are more abſolute and imperious than the Decrees of the Pope and his Cardinals, in relation to Religion and all other ſecular Matters. The preſent contending Parties are the *Caffinites* and the *Monkiſts*, who borrow their Names from *Matthew Caffin* of *Surrey*, and from *Thomas Monk* of *Buckinghamſhire*; at firſt Two intimate Friends, but fell at variance at ſome notice that *Caffin* took of *Monk*'s laſcivious Behaviour with a dear Siſter, one *S—r—h J———ſs*. *Caffin* inform'd the next general Aſſembly of the Matter; but they apprehending, that if they took any Cognizance of the ill Behaviour of ſuch an Eminent Brother, others might be queſtion'd as irregular in their Lives, which might bring a publick Scandal upon their Sect, therefore they put a ſtop to this dangerous Inquiſition. Now *Monk* and his Party, to revenge themſelves upon *Caffin*, oblig'd the general Aſſembly of 1699. to declare *Matthew Caffin* and his Diſciples, to have brought a Scandal upon the Ways and People of God; That they are the Sink of Hereſies and Errors, Blaſphe-

Blaſphemers and Idolaters; That a Separation from the Tents of thoſe Wicked Men was neceſſary; That they are falſe Teachers, and deſerve to be Hang'd and Burn'd as Traytors, *&c.* 'Tis worth our obſervation, that both Parties are erroneous, in relation to the Divine and Humane Natures of Chriſt, and expreſs their Sentiments to the ſame purpoſe in different Words, *That Chriſt is not of the uncreate Subſtance of his Father; That God made him a Creature only of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones, in the Virgin's Womb, not of the Fleſh of* Mary, *but the Matter of the Word, was turn'd into Fleſh in her Womb.* This is the Doctrine of the *Caſſinites*, for which the adverſe Party, that call themſelves Orthodox, tho' as Heretical in divers Opinions, divide from them. In the Year 1696. Forty of their Jolly Biſhops and Meſſengers, Publiſh'd their Mandates to all their Churches to that purpoſe, to forbid Communion with the *Caſſinites:* Yet another Aſſembly *Anno Domini* 1704. declared againſt this Decree, and judg'd it lawful to joyn with thoſe, againſt whom they had been ſo violent in Print, tho' they had not alter'd their Perſwaſion. The Reaſon of this great Change, was the Knowledge that ſome of the Heretick Party had got, of the Vile Enormities and Wicked Lives of moſt of the Orthodox Party.

Party. To prevent a Discovery they clap'd up an hasty Agreement, which lasted not long: For one *Jenkins*, by Trade a Weaver, accused at the next general Assembly, one *Mary Yelder*, of his Meeting-house, *For denying the Lord that bought her*; and at the Meeting in *Goswel-Street*, exclaim'd against her as an Heretick, and that he had rather have Communion with the Criminals of *Newgate* and *Bridewell*, than with such Hereticks; tho' the Woman declar'd and proved her self to be innocent. But the Truth is, she was privy to his Life and Actions; and that she might not be credited, he resolv'd to brand her with Heresy.

In the Year 1699. one Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh*, had a Disputation with Doctor *Russel* at *Portsmouth*, at the Presbyterian Meeting-house, before the Deputy-Governour, the Mayor and Aldermen, about Infant-Baptism: Both Parties challeng'd the Victory to themselves; but according to the Judgment of the Honourable Assembly, the *Anabaptists* were basely baffled by these Presbyterians. This *Russel* was accused of divers Immoralities, of which he endeavour'd to clear his Reputation, by casting Dirt upon the Meeting at *Goswel-Street*, in Two Pamphlets, the one call'd *The Testimony of High-hall*, and the other from their Church at *Dean-Street*. Now some

ſome of theſe People being diſſatisfied with their former Creeds, have attempted to make new, as they of *Buckinghamſhire*, and therefore ſtiled by the contrary Party, *The* Buckinghamſhire *Creed-Makers*; and a late general Aſſembly have pretended to mend and alter their former Belief and Articles of Faith, which they impoſe upon all the Dipping-Sect, under pain of Damnation. And their Teachers exerciſe ſo abſolute, deſpotick, and tyrannical Power over the Conſciences of their deluded Proſelytes, that for the leaſt diſſention from them, they proceed to Excommunication; witneſs the Caſe of *Barker* and *Downes*, lately tried in the *Queen's-bench*. One *Jenkins*, a *Weaver*, Biſhop of a Meeting at *Harts-ſtreet*, expell'd out of his Communion one Mr. *Chriſt. Barker*, only for deſiring *Pſalms* to be ſung in the Congregation; and for ſaying, *If any Man love not our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, let him be Anathema maran-atha.* And at his next appearance there, he was miſerably kick'd and abuſed by one *Downes*, a *Deacon*. I will conclude the Hiſtory of this abominable Sect, with ſome Paragraphs out of a Manuſcript written by an *Anabaptiſt*, which I have by me, and diſcovers this Myſtery of Satan.

They, he means their Teachers, *muſt be believed upon pain of eternal Damnation, from*

a Spirit of Pride or high Conceit of themſelves, and their own Abilities, whereby they are puffed up with ſuch a Degree of Popiſh Infallibility, that all that cannot ſee with the ſame Eyes as they do, muſt certainly be in a damnable State. A little after, *Inſtead of being Promoters of Truth, Love, Union, and Charity, they are but as ſo many Incendiaries, and Promoters of continual Hatred, Envy, Malice, Diſcord and Diviſion; that if ſuch turbulent Spirits were not overpower'd by thoſe that ſit at the Stern of Government, they would certainly turn all things into ſuch Confuſion and Diſtraction, that no Man could quietly enjoy any thing that is his proper Right, either in Civil or Religious Matters,* &c. Again, *'Tis further to be noted concerning* Matthew Caffin, *that his old Enemy* Joſeph Wright *and others, as* Hunt, Hore, Ruſſel, Taylor, Hook, Garret, Mulliner, Jenkins *and others, have incenſed both City and Country with ſuch partiality againſt him, that in the general Aſſembly ſome have been reflected upon to be Hereticks, only becauſe they lived in the ſame County with* Caffin.

And diſcourſing upon the Immoralities, and ſecret filthy Lives of theſe Deceivers, he ſaith, *There can be no Conditions of Peace to be expected or regarded, while there remains juſt cauſe to ſay as* Jehu *did to* Joram *in another Caſe, What Peace ſo long as the Whoredoms of thy Mother* Jezabel *and her Witch.*

Witchcrafts are so many! for it is certain that nothing but Confusion and Distraction would be the Issue and Consequence of uniting with such turbulent and ungovernable Spirits, &c. Again, the same Author saith, *These Orthodox Pretenders seem to be so fond of having and keeping Church-Communion to themselves and their own Party, because in their own Conceit they are sound in the Faith above others. But this is all a Jest, or that which is worse, down right Hypocrisy and Baseness; for if any do but countenance their Arbitrary Proceedings, account their Preachers Orthodox, and treat them with kind Entertainments and grateful Presents, that will sufficiently atone for Heresy or Immoralities; and of this 'tis well known many Instances might be given*, &c. A little after he saith, *Their Dismal and Black Charges and Accusations, are cover'd over with the fine and specious Pretences of Humbly beseeching in the Bowels of Christ, to promote this Blessed Reformation*, i. e. their Heretical Sect, *for the Honour of God, the Majesty of their Redeemer, the Purity of the Churches, and this very much resembles a poysoning Pill, which inwardly contains nothing but Death and Destruction*, &c.

I have transcrib'd all this out of the aforesaid Manuscript, written by a Zealous *Anabaptist*, who discovers at large there

there the Deviliſh Hypocriſy, Rage, Malice, Wickedneſs, and Immoralities, of their Principal Teachers. This will ſuffice to expoſe to the publick View, the Nature and Deſigns of this Pernicious Dipping-Sect.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 13. l. 14. read Tenſe. p. 84. in the Hebrew inſtead of a Mem, r. a Teth, Tabal Tebilah. p. 125. l. 31. r. 243. p. 135. l. 15. r. Sex. p. 186. l. 28. r. inſtruction, and l. 31. r. Eight Days old. p. 356. l. 10. r. 15. inſtead of 115. *Other Faults of the Preſs may eaſily be corrected by the Judicious Reader.*